University of Massachusetts Amherst
ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014

1-1-1987

Factors in student choice of graduate schools.

Robert B. Turcotte
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation
Turcotte, Robert B., "Factors in student choice of graduate schools." (1987). *Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014*. 4326.
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/4326

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Factors in Student Choice of Graduate Schools

A Dissertation Presented

by

ROBERT B. TURCOTTE

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1987

School of Education

Factors in Student Choice of Graduate Schools

A Dissertation Presented

by

ROBERT B. TURCOTTE

Approved as to style and content by:

Ronald K. Hambleton, Chairperson of Committee

William Lauroesch, Member

Robert F. Grose, Member

Mario D. Fantini, Dean
School of Education

Acknowledgments

Certainly no one completes a doctoral program, never mind a doctoral dissertation, on his own. What is uncommon is the reality of the help given. I am not able to adequately describe this help, or to express adequate appreciation for it.

The strength, devotion, and determination which flowed from my wife, Karen, was a constant source of peace and motivation for me. Karen allowed me to do this thing not solely by her acquiescence, but by her commitment and the assumption of many responsibilities which I could not fulfill. Without this remarkable woman, I would have failed miserably.

My two sons, Joseph and Brian, are glad to have their Daddy back again. No more weekends lost, no more nights without a good night kiss. For what they gave up, I thank them.

It is equally difficult to express the nature and degree of the help and support given me by the members of my Committee. Dr. Ronald K. Hambleton, my major professor, Dr. William Lauroesch, and Dr. Robert Grose took deliberate care to bolster my confidence by kind criticism, tolerance of my weaknesses, and by vigorous support of what strengths I did have. Their constant interest was in what I was learning and how I could

make the best use of what was learned. But to justly thank Dr. Hambleton, for all that he has done, it truly an impossible task. With great patience and fortitude, and a positive approach throughout, he allowed me to avail myself of his his wisdom, experience, and time in unusual measure. Only his willingness to do so, coupled with his personal kindness and warmth, made this dissertation possible.

To all of you, thank you.

ABSTRACT

FACTORS IN STUDENT CHOICE OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

MAY 1987

ROBERT B. TURCOTTE, B.S., BOSTON STATE COLLEGE

M.A., MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Directed by: Professor Ronald K. Hambleton

A study of 174 applicants to the University of Rhode Island's Graduate School was conducted to identify factors in student choice of graduate schools and to determine if enrollment intent could be predicted. A 20-item survey based on the motivational and cognitive decision making theory of Janis and Mann (1977) was constructed. Applicants were surveyed on two scales regarding: a) the importance of factors represented in the 20-item survey; and b) which graduate school choice better matched those factors.

Respondents to the survey were sorted into four groups: a) accepted; b) denied; c) accepted, intending to enroll at URI; and d) accepted, not intending to enroll at URI. Nine of the 20 items were identified by the respondents as important to use in deciding which graduate school to attend. A factor analysis of the importance ratings identified three strong, psychologically interpretable factors which matched the Janis and Mann

constructs used to develop the survey: a) Self Approval; b) Utilitarian Costs; and c) Concern for Others. The fourth factor, Concern for Self, showed a weak relationship to the Janis and Mann constructs.

A one way analysis of variance identified three factors on the Importance Scale which discriminated between the "Will Enroll" and the "Will Not Enroll" groups of respondents at the .05 level of significance: a) affordability; b) closeness to home; and c) being able to better support family upon graduation. The "Will Enroll" group assigned higher ratings of importance to these three factors.

Chi-square statistics identified eight factors which discriminated between the two groups at the .05 level of significance on the Match Scale, but, on only one factor did the two groups differ in terms of school choice: a) better academic program.

Classification of respondents into "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" groups from responses to the 20 item survey was demonstrated through discriminant analysis by a classification accuracy of 78 percent. The chance criterion was estimated to be 51%. (Discriminant analysis results may be inflated, however, due to the use of a single sample of respondents to estimate both the weights of the variables in the discriminant

analysis and the actual accuracy of classification using the discriminant analysis results.)

The research results have a) identified factors salient to a group of graduate school applicants in their decision to attend one graduate school as opposed to another; b) measured the degree of importance these factors had in that decision; c) identified significant differences between the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" groups; and d) predicted group membership. In addition, a base for determining the applicability of Janis and Mann's decision making constructs appears to have been established.

These results seem to be important in furthering the understanding of how people make decisions in general, and, how people make decisions relative to a particular choice, that of graduate school attendance. Colleges and universities wishing to influence accepted students to attend their schools may find these results useful. For example, schools may wish to identify factors which are salient to their applicant populations and adjust marketing approaches accordingly. Also, problems related to enrolling better qualified students and to achieving enrollment management objectives could be addressed by utilizing the survey instrument developed in this research.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (continued)

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background

As a research and general interest phenomenon, student choice among colleges has gained prominence in recent years. Educational organizations, research institutions, the Federal government, and colleges and universities are anticipating decreases in the available pool of traditional college-aged students. Knowledge of how the student college choice process works is thought to help schools influence student decisions to apply and attend, helping colleges to maintain the best possible enrollment posture during an era of predicted decline.

The Carnegie Council (1980), the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (1979, 1984), in association with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, and the College Board, are among those organizations which have forecast enrollment decreases of up to 14% nationwide and as high as 51% in certain states and/or regions of the United States by 1999. Hesburgh (1985) warns that American educational institutions are vulnerable due to a potential decline in student enrollments and a drop in federal financial support. As early as 1974, the

National Center for Educational Statistics warned the educational community about potential declines. Hossler (1984) pointed out that concern for college enrollment is not new. Schools experienced enrollment declines in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and again during the 1930s. Even during the 1960s, the so-called golden days of higher education, there was competition for students among campuses.

The Carnegie Council in 1981 reported that over 100 institutions of higher education closed their doors during the previous decade. The effects on enrollment of population declines, shifting student populations, economic factors, and what may be perceived by some as a retreat of Federal student financial aid are being felt.

However, as a motivation for interest in student college choice, pragmatic concerns do not stand alone. Colleges and universities, both private and public, have traditionally pursued college choice issues to bolster the academic quality of their institutions (Kemerer, Baldridge, & Green, 1982). Maintaining or increasing institutional quality and academic integrity have been universal motivations for college choice interest, and despite the emergence of more pragmatic concerns,

academic quality remains a major motivation for many colleges today as it has in the past.

Knowledge of how and why students choose a school is of interest for institutional academic quality as well as pragmatic reasons of enrollment maintenance. But, the insertion of marketing concepts and enrollment management strategies into the admissions and recruitment activities of colleges has intensified the search for ways and means of maximizing the probability of students choosing their institutions

Competition is clearly growing among institutions. The research interest is focused on why students apply to and enroll in one school rather than another (Owen, Campbell, Flanigan, & Wisdom, 1977). Three of the most widely used college choice research approaches are concentrated at the undergraduate level: a) Students are asked directly what is important to them when they choose a college; b) A second common approach measures the appeal of specific school characteristics and seeks to measure school attributes as attraction factors; c) In the third approach, schools attempt to find out the specific benefits people desire to receive from the school (Litten, Sullivan, & Brodigan, 1983).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

When people must choose among alternatives, whether the choice involves which school to attend or some other important life-decision, researchers are concerned with the types of search, deliberation, and selection processes people use (Janis, & Mann, 1977). That is, which decisional factors are involved? Is there a schema or theory which comprehends the process?

Litten et al. (1983) posit that when traditional college-bound high school students are compared with relatively mature adults, the latter have a clearer idea than the former about who they are, where they are going, and what they want from a college. Factors salient to graduate applicants and the schema or theory active in the choice of which graduate school to attend are therefore assumed to be different from those factors important to high school seniors when they make their college choice. The problem lies in identifying graduate school choice factors salient to the the more mature graduate school applicant, within a context of a specific schema or theory. It is believed that research geared towards trying to determine why people make the decisions they do ought to be based, a priori, on some decision making theory (Janis, & Mann, 1977). Research needs to be conducted at the graduate level to identify

decisional factors salient to the graduate school college choice process.

1.3 Purposes

In view of the shortage of research about graduate school student choice, a study which contributes to building a body of knowledge about the factors of graduate student college choice would have significant importance. This study concerned itself with trying to identify salient factors in the graduate school student choice process.

The purposes of the study were:

1. to identify factors salient to University of Rhode Island graduate school applicants in their decisions to attend one graduate school as opposed to another, utilizing cognitive decision making theory; and
2. to determine whether or not such factors actually predict graduate student college choice intent.

The phrase 'college choice' is used in several contexts. One focus is on the antecedent decisions students make whether or not to attend college. Variables salient to antecedent decisions are important and knowledge about that process may help schools target student populations for their marketing and recruitment efforts. A second focus, and the one which this study addressed, was on attendance decisions made by students.

The focus of the study was narrowed even further to the perceived motivations of student college choice. As a part of the effort to equip graduate schools with the tools they need to address enrollment concerns, additional studies needed to be conducted.

Questions addressed in the study were:

1. What factors lead to the decision to choose one specific graduate school over another and what degree of importance do these factors have?

2. Are there differences in choice factors and/or the importance of factors for accepted applicants who intend to enroll, and accepted applicants not intending to enroll?

3. Can enrollment intent among accepted applicants be predicted?

1.4 Outline of Study

In Chapter 2 a literature review is presented, organized around two major strands of work: the first major emphasis is on past and current college choice research; the second deals with cognitive decision making models.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology used in the study. This chapter includes a description of the student population, procedures followed, steps taken in the development of the survey, the time frames for survey development and administration. The results from the survey administration are

contained in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 contains a discussion of the survey results, including conclusions and suggestions for futher research.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

2.1 Introduction

The literature review for this research study is intended to analyze and interpret in capsule form: a) research in the field of undergraduate and graduate college choice, examining historical as well as current perspectives; and b) cognitive decision making models used in college choice research. Analysis and interpretation of past college choice research is necessary to provide an understanding of the work previously done, to identify the trends which have developed, and to identify what remains to be done. Examination of the cognitive decision making models used in college choice research helps to narrow the research approach and to better define the problem area.

For example, some difficulty does arise in categorizing college choice factors. As Beal (1980) points out, important college choice variables for some students are a college's academic reputation, the concern expressed by schools for students as individuals, faculty reputation, and facilities. Astin (1979) found that the dominant reasons for attending a college are: a) to get a good job; b) make more money; and c) to

get a general education. While the latter set could be construed to be general reasons for deciding to go to college, they may also be related to the choice among particular colleges. It is assumed that the choice of one college to attend is meant to ensure the achievement of those objectives.

Others (Grabowski, 1981; Owen et al., 1977) argue that the decision as to which school to attend is the product of an exchange relationship between student values and school attributes. The college choice process is viewed as a series of exchange relationships in which the school's attributes are seen as positive for decision making when and if such attributes are valued by prospective students and if the school is able to accurately project those attributes.

2.2 Background

Most college choice studies, especially those taking the form of institutional research, are aimed at determining ways and means of enhancing undergraduate enrollments as an end product. Among these studies, emphasis may vary at a given institution from concentration on institutional characteristics as student attraction factors, to the individual characteristics of potential students as determinants of college choice. Some studies seek to identify the student college choice process by

comparing student stated reasons for choosing between one school alternative and another, while others pursue specific individual student motives. Some educational researchers prefer to examine college choice as part of the general human decision making process. If one objective of a college or university is to identify ways and means to influence student college choice in favor of its school in response to academic and pragmatic concerns mentioned earlier, the motivational variables of college choice take on particular significance.

The need for undergraduate schools to maximize their enrollment posture during a time of decline appears to be self-evident. However, no studies have been conducted to anticipate the effect projected decreases in high school graduates may have on graduate enrollment as the number of undergraduate students diminishes. However, the absence of an empirical study similar to the WICHE studies (1979, 1984) for graduate schools does not in any way reduce the importance of the college choice issue for graduate schools.

The Carnegie Council (1980) expected graduate enrollment nation-wide to be stable or experience only a slight decline over the next 20 years. The Council supported its view by contending that the shift in graduate education from academic

apprenticeships to professional training would insulate the graduate community from the type of major enrollment decline the undergraduate community is facing. However, aggregate demographic information such as was used by the Council may tend to hide regional differences, and regional data may mask important state differences. Kremerer (1983) believes graduate education will probably be very volatile during the next twenty years, especially within degree levels and across disciplines.

The apparent lack of concern about the graduate community, when compared to the attention the undergraduate community is receiving, may be due to the same type of optimism expressed by presidents and admissions professionals of undergraduate colleges thought to be facing the worst undergraduate enrollment declines. Many college presidents seem to assume that their institutions will be immune to the decline in the traditional college aged group over the next 16 years (Kemerer, 1983). These presidents also seem more concerned about financial issues than enrollment issues. Over the next five years, 52 percent of the presidents of liberal arts colleges anticipate increased enrollments. These are the same institutions that are predicted to be severely affected by the demographic events of the 1980s.

If this analogy is valid, then false optimism may have led to a lack of concern at the graduate level as well.

In addition, according to Olson and Milton (1985), until recently, most public institutions have experienced neither a decline in graduate enrollment nor decreases in resources to support graduate education. Thus there has been no particular interest in examining the variables encompassed in the graduate college choice process.

The argument could be made that there is a built-in lead time of four years (1981-1985) before graduate schools would start to feel the affects of a decrease in high school graduates. However, for the Fall 1981 term the Council of Graduate Schools and the Graduate Record Examination Board reported that other factors caused a 1.1 percent national decline in overall graduate enrollment and a 2.0 percent decline in new graduate students (CGS Communicator, 1982). Linney (1985) reported that the number of students pursuing graduate education has decreased and that the National Commission on Student Financial Assistance has discerned signs of trouble, signs of erosion in the nation's graduate capacity. As is the case at the undergraduate level, Federal student financial support for graduate students has declined. Federally funded

fellowships and traineeships dropped from 60,000 in 1969 to 13,000 in 1981. Applications to graduate arts and sciences institutions declined 23 percent between 1974 and 1981 and have not made a come back. If this trend continues, and is coupled with a decrease in the traditional pool from which first year graduate students are drawn, graduate schools may well be faced with an enrollment problem equal to or greater than their undergraduate counterparts face now.

Clearly, a number of graduate institutions like their undergraduate counterparts, may experience little or no negative effect from the social and economic factors which may affect others. Some schools, as supported by the WICHE Study (1984), in the south and west will actually increase their enrollment due to population shifts. However, for those schools located in the other parts of the United States, the challenge as to whether or not schools will be subject to uncontrollable external factors is the same for undergraduate and graduate communities.

At the undergraduate level, a body of knowledge, based on empirical studies, is beginning to emerge. Kemerer, Baldridge and Green (1982) lay out the basic issues and themes of undergraduate enrollment management and cover such topics as

organizing for enrollment management, recruitment and retention, marketing strategies, market segmentation, and strategic planning. However, only three paragraphs are devoted to graduate school concerns. Proposals for addressing the graduate problem are limited to a "liaison system" for graduate recruiting which is linked to undergraduate enrollment management systems.

G.L. Rose (1978) addresses the problem through empirical approaches to defining and applying the relative drawing power of colleges and universities. His attention to graduate school problems is equally limited. The graduate component of higher education is treated in a similar manner by other writers and researchers (Lay and Maguire, 1978, 1980; Litten, 1979; (Leister, 1976; Terenzini, Hartmark, Lorang, & Shirley, 1980).

2.3 College Choice Research

Pacific Lutheran University conducted a study (Leister, 1975) to investigate the possibilities of: a) broadening its base of student appeal; b) increasing the efficient utilization of its physical plant; and c) penetrating new student populations unfamiliar with the educational products of PLU. The study was motivated by the institutional perception that competition among colleges was increasing, and that colleges and

universities were in general finding themselves in somewhat of a declining industry for the first time in recent history. PLU wanted to identify its position within its market and to enhance that position by determining institutional attributes salient to student college choice.

Traditional marketing approaches, popular in the 1960s, utilizing age, population, density and other human variables of demographic profiles, as an information base, were rejected in favor of a behaviorally based methodology: attitude research. The concept behind attitude research, according to Leister, is that human perception and human preference functions, with respect to a university's academic offering as a product, provide more leverage for developing ways and means of affecting college choice for colleges than do standard demographic information.

The approach was to ask groups of people to rate PLU on a one to one basis against eleven other colleges in the State of Washington to determine its market position relative to other schools. The groups included current students, local community leaders, students from other colleges and universities, employees of a major corporation, PLU faculty, and parents of private school children. If perceptions on dimensions were very

similar between schools, participants would assign a 1 on a nine point scale, if very dissimilar a 9 would be assigned. The dimensions measured were geographic location, school size, perceived quality, cost, perceived safety, and academic offerings. These dimensions, Leister admits, though not exhaustive of the criteria used to evaluate schools, were found to be important through a preliminary field study. The three most important criteria were perceived size, academic quality and the variety of course offerings.

In response to this survey, PLU decided to: a) reinforce and clarify its quality image in its regional market by adding innovative educational offerings; b) maintain and further the high price, but high quality appeal, by establishing an upper-middle-class early college; and c) improve its position relative to other schools by narrowing the perceived distance between PLU and others by appealing to special populations such as housewives with professional husbands and school-aged children. Other strategies were rejected as not being congruent with the empirical results of the study. An extensive non-credit continuing education program was discarded because it was perceived to conflict with PLU's quality image and price competition in the marketplace.

PLU believed this study permitted the university to identify and graphically display attitudes about it and allowed a screening and behavioral analysis of potential or present institutional clientele. The study identified the advantages and disadvantages PLU had relative to its competition, the target markets it should be pursuing and the products it ought to be offering.

However, the population surveyed did not include current applicants, nor did it include accepted applicants who did or did not decide to enroll. Surveying currently enrolled students might have biased the results whereas such students might bolster their decision to attend PLU by developing a post-decisional rationale in support of their decision. PLU faculty might be biased towards their own institution, local community leaders and employees of local business might also share a perception not consistent with a potential student. The parents of private school children might be appropriate if one held that the parents of undergraduate applicants were influential in the final decision.

Boston College administers an annual questionnaire to all accepted applicants, those who matriculate and those who enroll elsewhere, to determine who or what first caused interest in the

College and what factors contributed to the final decision to attend BC or enroll at another school (MaGuire, 1982). The questionnaire adopts a social psychological perspective of college choice. Maguire takes a psychological perspective of undergraduate college choice and includes two cognitive formations within the college choice process: a) image, the evolution of the general perception about a college or university; and b) decision, the appraisal of college and university attributes most salient when making the final college choice. However, Maguire's approach is not directly based on any cognitive decision making theory and treats university attributes as the sole variables which influence choice. Individual perceptions of a school are assumed to be influenced by the perceptions of competing schools. The basic questions to be answered are: a) Which institutional attributes form the basis for a comparison of colleges when the final college choice is made; and b) How do attributes interact to impact college choice? Maguire and Lay rephrase the questions: What attributes of colleges, if changed, can be expected to create the largest increase in enrollment yield?

Over 2,500 applicants accepted to Boston College were sent a two-part questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire

explored how, and through whom, the prospective student found out about BC and to what degree they were influenced by that contact. The second part of the questionnaire, the portion of interest here, asked each accepted applicant to make comparisons between BC and the accepted applicant's second choice school if the applicant decided to attend BC, or the school he/she planned to attend if BC's offer of admission had been rejected. Twenty-eight attributes were listed. Among them were: financial aid, distance from home, college faculty, male/female ratio, teaching reputation, school size, costs, general reputation, geographic location, housing opportunities, and admission literature.

Three of the listed attributes are difficult to accept as "institutional" attributes. They are: parents' preference, high school counselor's rating, and employment opportunities after graduation. This is not a negative criticism, Maguire and Lay stated that one interest was in who or what first caused interest in BC. These factors seem to be inappropriate for this section of the questionnaire. However, employment opportunities after graduation might be appropriate if that question were meant to refer to the prestige a BC degree might have and how

that prestige might help in procuring employment. It is not clear this is the intent of the question.

Seven attributes as predictors of college choice in favor of BC were identified. The same seven attributes, although in different order, were identified for BC's competitors. Financial aid ranked the highest in importance among the attributes of Boston College, but fifth among attributes of other schools. Students, therefore, tend to make their decision about whether to attend BC based primarily on how satisfied they are with the amount of financial aid made available. Maguire and Lay view this as an undesirable attribute, because, ideally, the amount of financial aid should not deter a student from attending a school which better meets the student's educational needs.

Parents' preference was the second highest attribute identified by the study. As stated earlier, such a factor is not seen as an institutional attribute, but surely highlights an important area for institutional action. The importance of Maguire and Lay rephrasing the primary question can be seen, i.e., what attributes of colleges, if changed, can be expected to create the largest increase in enrollment yield? Maguire and Lay point out more needs to be known about the bases of parents'

preferences before changes to attributes should be made to enhance a positive preference from this influential group.

The timing of the BC survey also appears to be especially important. The commitment to attend Boston College is already made when the survey is administered. Post-decisional bolstering, as with the Pacific Lutheran University survey of current students, might significantly influence responses.

The main thrust of the type of college choice research used by PLU and Boston College is best described by Owen et al. (1977) who argue that institutional analysis must be undertaken to find out why a college appeals to some and is less attractive to others. In the cause and effect relationship of college choice, the cause of choice is clearly viewed to be the institution. Owen et al. call for an identification of institutional attributes which are held valuable or valueless by the marketplace (students), and, action by the school to enhance the former and diminish the latter.

Olson and King (1985) conducted an exploratory study representing what they term as the beginning of the development of a model of college choice by prospective graduate students. Unfortunately the study sample was drawn from the current graduate student population of a large midwestern state

university. The sample population was 3,350 enrolled students; no applicants were surveyed. As with the Pacific Lutheran University and Boston College studies, it is possible that a considerable amount of post-decisional bolstering may have influenced the participants' responses. However, as an exploratory survey, it was designed to capture factors influencing the initial consideration of the graduate school students were attending, and, factors influencing the ultimate decision to enroll. Because participants were not asked to respond for the graduate school they would have attended if they had not chosen the midwestern school, there was no measurement of factors compared to another choice.

In terms of factors influencing the initial consideration, geographic location of the graduate school was the variable with the highest percentage response. It was followed by personal contact with a faculty member. However, positive interaction or contact with faculty was ranked the highest in terms of factors influencing the ultimate decision to enroll.

Olson and King suggest that there are a number of intervening personal factors between the initial consideration of which graduate schools to attend and the ultimate decision to enroll. Reasons frequently cited were: a) presence of a spouse

in a degree program; b) employment of spouse; c) compatibility with the community where the school was located; d) availability of part time enrollment and full time work.

The data seem to substantiate the fact that personal contact between a future mentor and his/her student is a crucial factor in effective graduate student recruitment, and, that prospective graduate students were influenced significantly by variables which are not typically found in undergraduate models.

Manski and Wise (1983) offer another facet of college choice research which does not include institutional attributes as direct motivational factors. Manski and Wise first concentrate on identifying individual and family background attributes which help to determine the likelihood of whether or not students will make the decision to apply to a college or university.

One Manksi and Wise study demonstrates that the probability of a student, with a combined SAT score (verbal plus math) which is one standard deviation above the mean, of applying for admission is .35 higher than the probability of a student whose combined score is one standard deviation below the mean. This same study assumes all other variables are equal, family background, race, sex, income and grade point average among others. This kind of research attempts to identify likely

groups of applicants utilizing statistical indices. Such research is supported by Zemsky (1980) and Morris, Elliot, Huddleston, Vaccaro, and Stump (1977) in their treatments of market profiles provided by the College Board and other demographic data sources. This information may help schools target student populations for their marketing and recruitment efforts.

Having completed the demographic analysis, Manski and Wise turned their attention to the selection of a college from among available alternatives and suggest a multinominal model that expresses the probability that a given student will select a given alternative. The model is a subjective expected utility model which includes the following decisional variables: a) the relative effect of tuition, financial aid, and living expenses on the student's evaluation of the direct cost of schooling; b) costs associated with the loss of earnings which could be accumulated during the college years if an employment alternative had been chosen; and c) the effect of perceived academic demands or standards expected by alternative schools on the student's prediction of his or her own success or failure at that school. Successful achievement at a high standards school

carries with it high credentials and good job opportunities after graduation.

High standards are also argued to decrease the probability of successful completion of the degree. The effect of perceived academic demands or standards expected by schools on the student's prediction of his or her own success or failure at that school, is an important congruence factor. Manski and Wise describe this factor as absolute success or failure, earning a degree or leaving college. However, congruence here means more. If students compare their conception of their academic abilities to the perceived academic standards of the schools to which they have been accepted, they may make college choice decisions based on the subjective probability of how well they will perform academically, not solely on whether or not they believe they can graduate.

Bandura (1982) terms this general phenomena as self-efficacy, or the degree to which the individual believes he or she is capable of coping with the environment he or she is in, or will enter into. As a congruence factor, an accurate self-efficacy determination will depend in part on the degree of accuracy the institution can muster in projecting its academic standards.

Manksi and Wise define the final college choice as that school alternative which has the maximum expected utility. Costs at each school plus the loss of employment income during school years added to the subjective judgement of successful completion of the degree must be balanced off by the future component of utility which is the expected contribution to future earnings made possible by the selection of the college alternative.

The utility dimension of college choice argued by Manski and Wise is absent from the college attribute variable models suggested by Leister (1975), Maguire and Lay (1980), and Maguire (1981). While financial aid was identified as a prime motivation of decisions to attend Boston College, and high academic quality at a high price was identified as a prime motivation at Pacific Lutheran University, neither approach included personal post-graduation considerations or the cognitive process suggested by expected utility theory. The Manski and Wise approach can be used to begin a conceptual shift away from institutional characteristics as prime motivational factors in college choice to a review of cognitive decision making models of college choice research.

2.4 Cognitive Decision Making Models

Morstan and Smart (1977) contend that most colleges have very little empirical information on the reasons underlying college choice decisions. Gordon (1982) asks the basic question: do students with different educational or vocational interests and goals attend college for different reasons? Pomazal (1980) posits that motivation to enroll in college is a goal-oriented behavior, and that understanding enrollment motivation is a crucial factor in designing recruitment strategies. Understanding these motivations helps explain choice among alternatives, not solely the decision to attend college.

Berry's definition of motivation (1971) is applicable here. Motivational factors are those distinguishable components of a person's motivations, whereas motivation is a drive which causes a person to seek or accomplish an objective, or seek satisfaction of a need. Rather than examine institutional attributes, many of which may serve more as attractions than as motivations, the cognitive models emphasize the drive which causes the student to seek college in the first instance, and to choose a particular college as the vehicle of exercising that drive in the second instance.

There are a number of models used to research college choice motivation. Much of the research has been done in the area of adult education, and is especially applicable to graduate school applicants. Houle (1961) established three basic motivations: a) goal-orientation, people who utilize education as a means of accomplishing clear-cut objectives; b) activity-orientation, people whose participation is unrelated to the purpose or content of education and who utilize the educational environment for social purposes; and c) learning-orientation, people for whom learning is a continuous part of their lives. Sheffield expanded Houle's typology to include: a) a societal-goal orientation by which the student wishes to accomplish some clear-cut social objective; and b) a need-activity orientation by which learning has an introspective or intra-personal meaning most often not related to the learning activity.

Building on the work of Houle and Sheffield, Boshier (1971) developed the Education Participation Scale (E.P.S.) from which fourteen first-order factors accounted for almost 70 per cent of the total variance among participants completing the scale. Some of the factors are: a) inner directed advancement, obtaining a well paying or high status job; b) other directed advancement, to comply with suggestions or demands of

significant others; c) social conformity, to maintain social position or achieve the status and prestige associated with school; d) social contact, to fulfill a need for personal association; e) social welfare, to improve one's ability to serve mankind; f) cognitive, to satisfy an inquirying mind or to seek knowledge for its own sake; and g) educational preparedness, to clarify what the student wants to be doing five years from know. These findings are consistent with those of Wolfgang (1979) who argues that some students are more likely to enroll in a school for social and environmental reasons, and because of external influences, while others are motivated for cognitive reasons.

Gordon (1982) completed a study of 305 first-quarter degree-oriented freshmen which substantiated motive differentiation among groups of students. Using Boshier's (1971) Educational Participation Scale and Holland's (1973) Vocational Preference Inventory, Gordon's results suggest that it is desirable for institutions to use multiple marketing approaches for attracting different types of students. A more people-oriented approach would attract a prospective business student with an emphasis on the value of a degree for professional advancement. A stronger appeal based on general

education curricular offerings would attract liberal arts-oriented students.

In addition, Boshier (1977) also advances the idea of intra-self congruence, the 'goodness of fit' between the potential student and the college environment. Congruence is a major tenet of college choice put forth by Grabowski (1981) and was mentioned earlier as a variable of Manski and Wise's (1983) utility theory.

In explaining the relationship between marketing and institutional goals, Grabowski argues that college programs must be student-oriented, assessing and serving the needs and interests of students, but at the same time considering student preferences in the context of the institution's mission and goals. Grabowski argues further that programs must be carefully designed to bring about voluntary exchanges of values between the institution and the student. The college choice process is viewed as a series of exchange relationships in which the college's values as represented by programming, access, demeanor and other variables are seen as either consistent or inconsistent with that drive which caused the student person to seek a college education in the first instance.

Boshier (1971, 1977) argues that the motivational drive for some college participants is best explained by homeostatic need. He argues that it has long been recognized as a basic principle of psychology that people are endowed with tendencies which cause them to maintain equilibrium or a state of synchrony [sic] between their constituent parts. People are seen to ward off tension or threat which are contained within the fourteen factors Boshier identifies in his Education Participation Scale.

A college education for some is seen as decreasing the tension created by the perceived need to procure a high paying, high status job, and, the potential tension created by the failure to so procure or to even position oneself to achieve that goal. It relieves the tension created by significant others whose expectations must be met. A college education may also relieve the tension caused by an inquiring mind. The latter Boshier concedes can be construed as a deliberate breakdown of homeostasis, as new drives, exploratory or curiosity, compel heterostatic behavior in order to achieve a preferred or more adequate homeostatic state at a different level.

Boshier contends that some students are either predominantly growth motivated or generally deficiency motivated. Deficiency

oriented people seek equilibrium as a means of decreasing tension and meeting perceived needs. Growth motivated students seek heterostasis or a development state which allows them to achieve a more adequate homeostatic state. Boshier contends that the latter idea coalesces with contemporary growth theories of human nature. Boshier's research seeks to identify the drive which causes a person to seek or accomplish an objective, or seek satisfaction of a need within the educational environment, but also as part of man's general process of growth and development. The question left unanswered however is: to what extent, if it is valid, is this variable salient to the choice among graduate school alternatives?

A cognitive conflict model of decision making comprehending both the cognitive and motivational aspects of choice argued by Boshier, Houle, Grabowski, and Sheffield, and, the utility aspect argued by Manksi and Wise has been developed by Janis and Mann (1977). In its original form, as a decisional balance sheet, it was perceived as being broadly applicable to all important decisions, whether those decisions were made within a formal context such as in organizations, or, involved important personal decisions such as the choosing of a college to attend.

Conceptualized within the balance sheet are the many different reasons a person may have for arriving at a complicated decision such as deciding which graduate school to attend. The large number of potential benefits, costs, and risks are intended to be analyzed among the alternative courses of action open to the decision maker. One of the main assumptions of the decisional balance sheet is identical to that found in the additive gain-loss models advanced by Vroom (1969) and others.

Janis and Mann attribute the foundation of their balance sheet model to the expectancy theory argued by Lewin (1948). Lewin posits that decisions by and large are the function of increases or decreases in the relative strength of two psychological forces arising from anticipations. One force which motivates is the expected net gain from an alternative which is the summation of all positive valences. The second force motivates the decision maker to avoid expected net losses which are the summation of all negative valences. A decision represents the resolution of conflict between the competing psychological forces.

Four major considerations are perceived to be involved in the conflict among alternatives: a) utilitarian gains and losses

for self; b) utilitarian gains and losses for others; c) self-approval or -disapproval; and d) approval or disapproval from significant others. Janis and Mann contend that utilitarian considerations often represent the major interest of social scientists who are primarily concerned with rational choices that maximize goals. Janis and Mann argue that non-utilitarian gains and/or losses exert considerable influence on decision making, so much so that they may counteract the expected utilitarian losses or gains that would otherwise result in the choice of a different alternative.

According to the decisional balance sheet model, a pro and con scale is established for each of the four major considerations. The probability of making the most adequate choice (for the individual by the individual) is highest when the decision maker provides positive responses in all four areas relative to a specific alternative.

It must be pointed out that originally the balance sheet was seen as primarily a decision making tool to assist individuals in making better decisions, and, to decrease post-decisional regret brought about by decisions perceived as being poor resulting from inadequate decision making procedures or habits. Studies utilizing an interview format were completed by Janis

and Mann (1977) with high school seniors trying to decide which college to attend. The experimental group exhibited less post-decisional distress and felt more secure about their decisions than the control group. For these students, as individuals, their choice of a college was perceived by themselves as a good decision.

Although college choice has been used by Janis and Mann (1977) as an illustrative example of the applicability of the decisional balance sheet, no empirical data have been reported. Janis and Mann admit that quantitative methods for assessing and combining the positive and negative indicies of the decisional balance sheet are not very well developed, and until they are, the decisional balance sheet could not be used to predict which choice a person will end up making (e.g. whether he will accept or reject an offer of admission to a college). Janis and Mann invited further research to develop more fully the balance sheet theory and to determine its validity and reliability. Recently, research utilizing the Janis and Mann model for predicting the cessation of cigarette smoking, has proved the predictive validity of the model (Velicer, Prochaska, DiClemente, & Brandenburg, 1985).

2.5 Summary

This review has attempted to reflect the ways in which researchers and practitioners have addressed aspects of the college choice phenomenon. We have seen that interest in the phenomenon by institutions of higher education has been generated by the pragmatic realities of enrollment declines caused by a variety of factors. Concurrent with, and preceding that pragmatic concern, has been the desire on the part of colleges and universities to maintain or enhance the quality of their students.

Colleges and universities have looked inward to identify the institutional attributes which may, or may not, be attractive to students, and have sought to use that knowledge to motivate students to apply to and attend their schools. Researchers have sought to delineate other facets of student college choice motivations such as the influence of significant others and utilitarian considerations, which must be considered college choice factors as well. Still others add to the body of knowledge concerning college choice by exploring the basic motivations or drive behind a person's decision to attend college and to apply those motivations to the choice of a specific college.

Researchers have also theorized that the choice of a college might be motivated by a student's need to achieve equilibrium with his/her environment by eliminating tension and conflict caused by internal or external pressures or the need to grow. Education in general provides an alternative through which equilibrium might be found, but whether it is salient to the process of choosing among college alternatives is unknown. Clearly all possible student choice factors have not been exhausted.

Finally we have seen an approach which views college choice as but one of many important life decisions a person faces. The process a person follows in making a choice among colleges is viewed to be the same process one would follow when making all important life decisions.

The literature reviewed provides a history of the kinds of college choice research which has been most often conducted. It balances the demographic approach with both the institutional attribute model and the cognitive decision making theories. But perhaps most important, this review provides the basis on which the inventory for the study was developed to measure graduate school choice factors, and, points out the importance of timing in administering such an inventory. Each study reviewed has

chosen to survey participants after the point at which accepted students have enrolled or made a commitment to enroll. This study surveyed participants prior to their making such a commitment in an attempt to eliminate any post decisional bolstering which might occur.

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The purposes of the study were:

1. to identify factors within the framework of cognitive decision making theory which are salient to graduate school applicants in their decisions to attend one graduate school as opposed to another; and

2. to determine whether or not such factors predict graduate student college choice intent.

Chapter 3 includes a description of a) the student population for the survey; b) the procedures followed in conducting the research; c) the steps taken in the development of the survey; d) the time frame; and e) the survey administration.

3.2 Description of the Student Population

All persons residing in the United States who applied to the University of Rhode Island's Graduate School for the Spring 1986 term, and who applied by the November 15, 1985 application deadline, and whose application received a final decision, were mailed surveys. The survey was administered to 278 applicants; 214 surveys were returned. Of the total surveys returned, 40 were not useable either because they were incomplete or returned after the required deadline. The return rate for surveys was

about 77% (see Table 1). A demographic description of the respondents to the survey is contained in Table 2. Men comprised 51% of the respondents, women 49%. For those admitted, 80 were female and 80 were male. 92 percent of the respondents to the survey were admitted; 82% of those admitted intended to enroll at the University of Rhode Island. In terms of residence, 57% of the respondents were residents of Rhode Island, 43% were nonresidents.

Table 1

Summary Statistics of the Survey Returns

Number of Surveys Distributed	Returned	Useable	Percent of Surveys Returned
278	214	174	77%

3.3 Description of Survey and Developmental Steps

The survey, limited to 20 items, was based on the four general cognitive decision making categories identified by Janis and Mann (1977): a) utilitarian reasons for self; b) utilitarian reasons for others; c) affective reasons for self; and d) affective reasons for others. Prior to administering the survey and for the purposes of validating the survey and obtaining

Table 2

Demographic Description of the Respondents to the Survey, N=174

Groups	Admission		Enrollment Decision		Residence		Age			
	Admit	Denied	Will Enroll	Will Not Enroll	In State	Out State	21-25	26-29	30-39	40-60
Male	80	8	60	20	43	45	26	26	28	8
Female	80	6	71	9	57	29	23	21	30	12
Admitted	160	0	131	29	91	69	42	43	55	20
Denied	-	14	-	-	8	6	7	4	3	0
Will Enroll	131	0	131	0	89	42	28	38	47	18
Will Not Enroll	29	0	0	29	2	27	14	5	8	2
Instate	91	8	89	29	9	0	23	24	35	17
Outstate	69	6	42	27	0	75	26	23	23	3

suggestions for improving it, the survey was given to 35 doctoral students enrolled in a University of Massachusetts' educational research course, and admissions professionals employed at the University of Rhode Island.

The survey was divided into two parts: In Part A, respondents were asked first to indicate the importance of the 20 reasons. Importance ratings were provided on a three point scale. If the reason was "Not Important", participants were directed to circle NI; if the reason was "Somewhat Important", SI; and if the reason was "Important", I. Regardless of the rating assigned to each reason, respondents were also asked to indicate which school provided the better match, the University of Rhode Island, the Other School, or, No Difference. In summary, Part A required respondents to provide two ratings of each of 20 possible reasons for choosing a graduate school. In Part B of the survey, respondents were asked to provide some demographic information about themselves, and, to list the primary reasons they had for: a) wanting to go to graduate school; b) wanting to attend URI; and c) wanting to attend the other school. A copy of the survey is contained in Appendix A.

Participants in the study were told that the purpose of the survey was to try to identify reasons why students make the

choices they do about graduate schools. They were told that the interest in the study centered on the importance these reasons might have in their choice between attending the University of Rhode Island and some other school they might attend if they did not choose URI.

3.4 Procedures/Time Frame

An important aspect of the study was the guarantee of anonymity to participants. An initial computer file containing the names and addresses of potential participants was generated from the University of Rhode Island's administrative computer center. A consent form was mailed with the survey and was the only document containing the participant's name. To participate in the study, applicants were required to sign and return the consent form. The consent form contained a complete explanation of the study and identified the process guaranteeing anonymity. A copy of the letter and consent form are contained in Appendix A.

Participants were also asked to complete the survey, seal the survey in the envelope provided, and then hold the sealed envelope until they had received their admission decisions from the University of Rhode Island. Upon receiving their decisions, participants were then asked (1) to mark on the front of the

envelope whether or not they were admitted, and if admitted, whether or not they intended to enroll and (2) to mail in their surveys.

The survey and consent form were sent to potential participants at the time when URI academic departments returned, with their admissions recommendations, applicant dossiers to the Graduate School for a final admission decision. A final decision is usually reached within three to five days of the receipt of the departmental recommendation. This time frame was chosen to reduce the length of time between the potential participant's receipt of the request to participate in the study, and, the Graduate School's notification to the applicant of the admission decision. The expectation was that the short time frame between the request and the final decision would enhance participation.

Receipt of consent forms was recorded on the same computer file established to provide the initial mailing. Follow-up letters were sent to increase participation.

In summary, the following steps were carried out in developing and administering the survey:

Activity	Completion Date
1. Preparation of survey objectives and methods of data analyses	September 5, 1985

Activity	Completion Date
2. Selection of student population	September 12, 1985
3. Construction of survey items, survey format, and letter of transmittal	October 10, 1985
4. Survey pretest	October 21, 1985
5. Revision of survey items	November 4, 1985
6. Revision of survey format and letter of transmittal	November 21, 1985
7. Mailing of survey	November 25, 1985
8. Establishment of SAS, SPSS and BMDP data files	December 14, 1985
9. Follow-up letter to nonrespondents	January 3, 1986
10. Completion of data collection	March 2, 1986
11. Completion of data input	March 2, 1986
12. Completion of data analyses	October 15, 1986

Chapter 4

Results

4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the results of the reliability, validity, analyses of variance, chi-square, and discriminant analysis studies along with associated tables and interpretations, and, a descriptive analysis of responses to open-ended questions 25, 26, and 27 in the survey.

Two anomalies occurred in the data which warrant discussion at this point because they had implications for the approaches chosen for data analysis. The first occurred with the university's acceptance rate of the respondents. Historically the average acceptance rate of applicants to the University of Rhode Island's graduate school has been about 45%. The acceptance rate reported by respondents in this study was 92%. The graduate school's acceptance rate for Spring 1986 was 58%.

The second anomaly occurred with admitted applicants intending to enroll. Historically, only about 50% of those admitted actually enroll. In this study, 82% of the admitted students indicated they intended to enroll. The actual new student enrollment rate for Spring 1986 was 52%. The relatively low numbers of denied and will not enroll respondents in the

study substantially limited the types of analyses that could be carried out on theses two important groups of respondents.

4.2 Factors in Graduate School Selection

Table 3 provides a summary of the importance participants attached to 20 possible factors in graduate school selection. Nine of the 20 factors achieved an average rating of 2.0 or above on a three point scale (3=Important, 2=Somewhat Important, 1= Not important).

The factors which were most important to URI graduate school applicants in their decisions to attend one graduate school as opposed to another in this study are: a) affordability; b) learning more; c) getting a better job; d) better research; e) better program for the degree desired; f) the graduate school's close proximity to home; g) better able to support family after graduation; h) less financial strain on the family while attending school; and i) feeling more in control of life plans. Graduate school applicants, using these factors as decision making criteria, showed an array of concerns which cut across the utilitarian and nonutilitarian gains and losses described by Janis and Mann (1977). Of the nine factors with average importance ratings of 2.00 or greater, four were categorized as utilitarian for self with a mean response of 2.20: a) affordability, 2.26; b) better employment prospects, 2.29;

Table 3

Importance of 20 Factors in Graduate School Selection, N=174

Factors in Graduate School Selection	Construct*	Importance Mean**	SD
1. I can better afford to attend this school.	US	2.26	.82
2. I should learn more at this school.	AS	2.63	.65
3. I will probably get a better job if I attend this school.	US	2.29	.79
4. Better research in my field is conducted at this school.	AS	2.27	.82
5. This school has the better program for for the degree I want.	AS	2.66	.63
6. This school is located close to my home.	US	2.22	.87
7. Attending this school has been a longtime goal of mine.	AS	1.45	.68
8. My status from attending this school would be higher.	AS	1.89	.81
9. Some persons feel I can't handle the program at this school. I want to prove I can handle the program.	AO	1.22	.53
10. A degree from this school should enable me to support my family better.	UO	2.00	.85
11. Persons I care about would be happier if I attend this school.	AO	1.51	.71

Table 3 (continued)

Importance of 20 Factors in Graduate School Selection, N=174

Factors in Graduate School Selection	Construct*	Importance Mean**	SD
12. It would mean more to me to be associated with the faculty of this school.	AS	1.68	.78
13. While attending this school it would be easier for me to help family or friends.	UO	1.74	.80
14. This school is far away from home, and I want to be away from home.	US	1.08	.33
15. Some persons feel I can handle the program at this school.	AO	1.32	.61
16. The financial strain on my family would be less if I attend this school.	UO	2.02	.84
17. I would attend this school primarily because others want me to.	AO	1.10	.37
18. My academic performance would be better at this school.	US	1.88	.81
19. The social prestige of my family would increase if I attend this school.	AO	1.27	.54
20. I would feel more in control of my life plans if I attend this school.	AS	2.04	.82

* US = Utilitarian for Self; AS = Affective for Self; UO = Utilitarian for Others; and AO = Affective for Others.

** 1 = Not Important, 2 = Somewhat Important, 3 = Important.

c) school location, 2.22; and d) better able to support family, 2.00. Utilitarian considerations are matters of objective utility for the individual or others. It is clear that utilitarian choice factors were very important to applicants in this decision making process.

Of the remaining five factors with high ratings of importance (2.00 or greater) four were categorized as affective for self and had a higher average importance rating (2.40) than the utilitarian factors: a) learning more, 2.63; b) better research, 2.27; c) better degree program, 2.66; and d) more in control of life plans, 2.04. Affective concerns represent matters of subjective utility, matters of subjective worth, and may represent personal nonutilitarian values.

Janis and Mann (1977) argue that affective or nonutilitarian factors may have a greater influence than utilitarian factors on the assessment of the losses and gains people attach to alternative decisions. In this case, affective choice factors were held to be more important than utilitarian factors, although factors expressing both constructs were thought to be important when deciding which graduate school to attend.

Only two of the nine factors held important showed a concern for others. Respondents felt it was important to choose a

school which would a) have the lesser financial strain on the family while attending school; and b) which would enable them to better support their family upon graduation. These two factors had importance ratings of 2.02 and 2.00, respectively.

Factors considered less important in choosing a graduate school were: a) to fulfill a longtime goal; b) to gain higher status for self; c) to prove to others that they could handle the academic program at a particular school; d) to make others happier; e) to be associated with the faculty of a particular school; f) attend a school so that he/she could more easily help family or friends; g) attending a school far away from home because he/she want to be far away from home; h) because others feel he/she could handle the academic program; i) primarily because others want them to attend a particular school; j) because his/her academic performance would be better; and k) because the social prestige of the family would be higher.

Of the eleven factors considered less important, six were categorized as factors concerning others. A total of seven factors in the survey showed utilitarian or affective concern for others. It is clear on the basis of mean responses that meeting the utilitarian and affective concerns of others

was not very important to applicants in choosing a graduate school. Of the remaining five factors, four were affective concerns for self. There were a total of eight affective for self factors in the survey. Factors such as prestige and longtime goal achievement were not very important to the respondents. The remaining factor, family prestige, an affective for others factor, was also not very important to respondents.

4.3 Reliability of the Survey Data

Coefficient alpha was chosen to measure the internal consistency of the two scales (i.e. importance and match). In addition, because it was not possible to administer equivalent forms of the survey or to repeat the administration of the survey, reliability was also assessed using the correlated split-half reliability method. With an N of 174 and 20 survey items, coefficient alpha was .75 on the Importance Scale and .78 on the Match Scale; the corrected split-half reliability estimate was .74 for the Importance Scale and .79 for the Match Scale. These levels of reliability (reported in Table 4) were quite reasonable for a 20-item instrument.

Table 4

Reliability Statistics for the Scales

N= 174

Statistic	Importance Scale	Match Scale
Number of Survey Items	20	20
Coefficient Alpha	.75	.78
Corrected Split-Half Reliability Estimate	.74	.79

A factor analysis of the respondent importance ratings of the 20 factors in the survey was carried out. A four factor solution is shown in Table 5. The analysis was based on the responses of the 174 participants who completed the survey; a four factor solution was chosen to demonstrate, if possible, that the survey did measure psychologically interpretable factors which could be found within the four Janis and Mann constructs. Utilizing the maximum likelihood factor analysis method and a varimax rotation scheme, the final factor pattern was well defined and psychologically interpretable. The four factors accounted for 32% of the total variance; the average squared loading was .31.

The rotated factor pattern matrix in Table 5 does highlight, for the most part, the four underlying constructs used in developing the survey: a) utilitarian concerns for self; b) utilitarian concerns for others; c) affective concerns for self; and d) affective concerns for others. Three especially well defined factors emerged. Using .40 as a criterion for separating significant from non significant loadings, Factor 1, consists of five variables with loadings of .40 or higher. Each variable expressed an affective for self or nonutilitarian for

Table 5

Rotated Factor Pattern Matrix (N=174)

Variable	Factor 1	2	3	4
1. Better Program	0.58*	0.04	-0.09	0.07
2. Better Research	0.57*	0.09	-0.04	0.04
3. Learn More	0.51*	0.14	-0.02	-0.00
4. Self Status	0.47*	-0.31	0.24	-0.04
5. Life Control	0.42*	0.00	0.18	0.23
6. Better Job	0.37	0.04	0.23	-0.06
7. Goal	0.35	-0.05	0.12	0.20
8. Faculty	0.35	-0.16	0.26	0.29
9. Support Others	0.29	0.07	0.19	0.17
10. Financial Strain	0.11	0.77*	0.18	0.15
11. Better Afford	0.26	0.71*	-0.03	-0.00
12. Close to Home	-0.06	0.19	0.09	-0.12
13. Others Happier	0.17	0.09	0.75*	0.08
14. Help Others	0.08	0.35	0.47*	0.15
15. Please Others	-0.08	0.05	0.43*	0.09
16. Family Prestige	0.20	-0.23	0.32	0.13
17. Handle Program	0.12	0.04	0.25	0.53*
18. Away From Home	-0.19	-0.02	0.01	0.49*
19. Academics Better	0.40	0.11	0.06	0.48*
20. Not Handle Program	0.21	-0.00	0.08	0.30
Sum of Squared Loadings	2.20	1.50	1.45	1.13
Average Squared Loading	.11	.07	.07	.06
Sum Average Squared Loading All Factors				0.31

* Loadings of .40 or higher were viewed as significant in interpreting the factors.

self construct. This factor of graduate school choice might be labeled 'Self Approval': "Will this school enable me to become the kind of person I want to be?". Prominent items loading on this factor were: 20) being in more control of life plans if this school were attended; 8) personal self status would be be higher; 2) more would be learned; 5) enrolled in the better academic program, 4) with the better research program if this school were attended.

Factor 2 was defined by two variables, one for self and one for others, expressing a utilitarian/financial construct. This construct expresses the expected instrumental effects of the costs of the alternatives both for the individual and for others who may be involved in financing graduate education or who would be effected by the high or low cost: 1) I can better afford to attend this school; and 16) the financial strain on my family would be less. This construct could be labeled 'Costs'.

Factor 3 contained three variables, two nonutilitarian and one utilitarian, each expressing a concern about others. Not only is there a concern about how others will react to a choice of schools, but, there is a concern about the well-being of others: 11) people I care about would be happier if I attend this school; 13) I will be able to help others easier; 17) I

will attend primarily because others want me to. Factor 3 could be labeled 'Concern for Others'.

Factor 4 was defined by three variables, two utilitarian reasons for self and one affective reason for others. The fourth factor is not as well defined as the first three. The two utilitarian for self variables in Factor 4 are: 14) the desire to attend a school away from home; and 18) the belief that the student's academic performance would be better if one school was attended rather than another. The nonutilitarian variable in Factor 4, statement 15, concerns the opinion of others that the student can handle the program better at one school than at another school.

The latter variable was defined, a priori during the construction of the survey, as nonutilitarian for others because there was no apparent effect on others if the applicant where to identify this item as an important decision variable and because its influence as a motivational variable flowed from significant others and not from self. The loading of this item on Factor 4 may mean that participants see little or no distinction between the motivational end result of choosing a school because they think they will do better academically, and, choosing a school because others think they can handle the program better or do

better academically. This latter variable might have been viewed as a utilitarian reason "of" others for the student rather than a nonutilitarian reason for others.

Each of the first three factors is identified by separate groups of items which correlate more highly among themselves than with variables outside the group. Therefore the factor analysis results support the instrument's discriminant validity. It was expected that the four factors would correspond in a psychologically interpretable manner to the four Janis and Mann decision making constructs from which the survey items were developed. The first three factors do make sense when compared to the four Janis and Mann constructs, suggesting a strong internal structure. The fourth factor appears to have only a weak relation to one of the Janis and Mann constructs because one of the three items loading on factor four (15) is not psychologically congruent with the other two. The two items which were psychologically interpretable represent nonfinancial utilitarian concerns for self and represent the fourth and final Janis and Mann construct.

4.5 Comparison of "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups

The differences between the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" groups concerning the importance of the 20 factors in their graduate school choice are summarized in Table 6. The differences were studied using a one-way ANOVA design with two groups. This analysis is equivalent to a t-test with independent groups. Significant differences were found at the .05 level on 3 of the 20 enrollment factors. As was mentioned earlier, 9 of the 20 factors were considered important in the choice of graduate schools by all participants. However, the "Will Not Enroll" group considered only six of the nine factors important: 2) learning more; 3) getting a better job; 4) better research; 5) better degree program; 16) less financial strain on family; and 20) better control of own life. There was no statistically significant difference between the two groups on these last two factors judged to be important.

Of the nine factors judged to be important (mean response 2.00 or greater), three factors were responded to differently by the two groups: 1) being better able to afford to attend a graduate school; 6) attending a graduate school close to home; and 10) being better able to support their families with an earned degree from this school. Those who "Will Not Enroll" at

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics On the Importance Scale of the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Admitted", "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups (N=174)*

Items	Admitted (N=160) Mean	SD	Will Enroll (N=131) Mean	SD	Will Not Enroll (N=29) Mean	SD	F	P
1.	2.24	.82	2.30	.82	1.96	.82	4.05	.04**
2.	2.64	.65	2.67	.62	2.51	.78	1.31	.25
3.	2.26	.79	2.30	.78	2.10	.85	1.52	.21
4.	2.26	.82	2.22	.82	2.44	.78	1.69	.19
5.	2.68	.60	2.67	.61	2.68	.60	0.01	.93
6.	2.25	.86	2.39	.80	1.58	.86	23.62	.01**
7.	1.45	.67	1.46	.68	1.37	.62	0.39	.53
8.	1.89	.81	1.90	.81	1.82	.80	0.23	.62
9.	1.18	.46	1.19	.48	1.13	.35	0.40	.52
10.	2.00	.84	2.05	.85	1.72	.75	3.68	.05**
11.	1.50	.71	1.50	.72	1.51	.68	0.01	.92
12.	1.69	.79	1.69	.77	1.68	.89	0.01	.97
13.	1.73	.80	1.76	.81	1.62	.77	0.74	.38
14.	1.05	.28	1.04	.24	1.10	.40	1.00	.31
15.	1.31	.60	1.30	.59	1.34	.66	0.10	.75
16.	2.00	.84	2.06	.82	1.75	.87	3.09	.08
17.	1.10	.35	1.09	.33	1.13	.44	0.39	.53
18.	1.85	.81	1.85	.81	1.82	.80	0.03	.86
19.	1.28	.53	1.26	.53	1.34	.55	0.49	.48
20.	2.03	.82	2.04	.82	1.96	.86	0.22	.63

* F and P are based upon a comparison of the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups.

** P <.05.

URI did not believe these factors to be as important in their decision making.

The qualitative distinction between the two groups as represented by the three factors is that for those who "Will Not Enroll": a) the financial burden of a graduate degree is not as much of a concern; b) they have no overriding desire or need to attend a school close to home; and c) anticipating financial benefits to be gained for one's family after earning a degree from a particular school is not a major concern. These considerations represent three utilitarian factors. It is interesting to note that affective, nonutilitarian concerns dominate the factors which are important to the "Will Not Enroll" group; four of the six factors for choosing a graduate school are nonutilitarian for self factors. The "Will Enroll" group, on the other hand, indicated a balance of utilitarian and nonutilitarian factors are important.

Table 7 provides the statistics comparing the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" groups in terms of their opinions about the match of the 20 possible enrollment factors to URI and the Other School. Respondents were asked, regardless of the importance they placed on an enrollment factor, to choose the alternative which best matched that factor: a) URI; b) the Other School; or c) No Difference. Ten factors were found to be

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics On the Match Scale for the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups*

1.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 80 %= 50.00	N= 38 %= 23.75	N= 13 %= 8.13	131 81.88	Better Afford
Will Not Enroll	N= 6 %= 3.75	N= 14 %= 8.75	N= 9 %= 5.63	29 18.13	Chi-square=17.611 P** = .001
Total	N= 86 %= 53.75	N= 52 %= 32.50	N= 22 %= 13.75	160 100.00	

2.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 41 %= 25.62	N= 56 %= 35.00	N= 34 %= 21.25	131 81.88	Learn More
Will Not Enroll	N= 5 %= 3.13	N= 14 %= 8.75	N= 10 %= 6.25	29 18.13	Chi-square= 2.426 P = .297
Total	N= 46 %= 28.75	N= 70 %= 43.75	N= 44 %= 27.50	160 100.00	

3.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will	N= 33 %= 20.62	N= 55 %= 34.38	N= 43 %= 26.87	131 81.88	Better Job
Will Not Enroll	N= 3 %= 1.88	N= 16 %= 10.00	N= 10 %= 6.25	29 18.13	Chi-square= 3.276 P = .194
Total	N= 36 %= 22.50	N= 71 %= 44.38	N= 53 %= 33.13	160 100.00	

Table 7 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics On the Match Scale for the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups*

4.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 35 %= 21.87	N= 58 %= 36.25	N= 38 %= 23.75	131 81.88	Better Research
Will Not Enroll	N= 6 %= 3.75	N= 10 %= 6.25	N= 13 %= 8.13	29 18.13	Chi-square= 2.737 P = .255
Total	N= 41 %= 25.62	N= 68 %= 42.50	N= 51 %= 31.88	160 100.00	

5.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 64 %= 40.00	N= 37 %= 23.12	N= 30 %= 18.75	131 81.88	Better Program
Will Not Enroll	N= 7 %= 4.38	N= 8 %= 5.00	N= 14 %= 8.75	29 18.13	Chi-square= 8.832 P** = .012
Total	N= 71 %= 44.38	N= 45 %= 28.12	N= 44 %= 27.50	160 100.00	

6.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will	N= 69 %= 43.13	N= 39 %= 24.37	N= 23 %= 14.38	131 81.88	Close to Home
Will Not Enroll	N= 4 %= 2.50	N= 18 %= 11.25	N= 7 %= 4.38	29 18.13	Chi-square=15.367 P** = .001
Total	N= 73 %= 45.63	N= 57 %= 35.62	N= 30 %= 18.75	160 100.00	

Table 7 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics On the Match Scale for the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups*

7.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 21 %= 13.11	N= 94 %= 58.75	N= 16 %= 10.00	131 81.88	Longtime Goal
Will Not Enroll	N= 1 %= .63	N= 23 %= 14.38	N= 5 %= 3.13	29 18.13	Chi-square= 3.376 P = .185
Total	N= 22 %= 13.74	N= 117 %= 73.13	N= 21 %= 13.13	160 100.00	

8.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 34 %= 21.25	N= 48 %= 30.00	N= 49 %= 30.63	131 81.88	Self Status
Will Not Enroll	N= 2 %= 1.25	N= 14 %= 8.75	N= 13 %= 8.12	29 18.13	Chi-square= 5.000 P = .082
Total	N= 36 %= 22.50	N= 62 %= 38.75	N= 62 %= 38.75	160 100.00	

9.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will	N= 7 %= 4.38	N= 115 %= 71.87	N= 9 %= 5.62	131 81.88	Cannot Handle Program
Will Not Enroll	N= 0 %= .00	N= 28 %= 17.50	N= 1 %= .63	29 18.13	Chi-square= 2.199 P = .333
Total	N= 7 %= 4.38	N= 143 %= 89.37	N= 10 %= 6.25	160 100.00	

Table 7 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics On the Match Scale for the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups*

10.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 21 %= 13.12	N= 92 %= 57.50	N= 18 %= 11.25	131 81.88	Better Support Family
Will Not Enroll	N= 1 %= .63	N= 21 %= 13.12	N= 7 %= 4.38	29 18.13	Chi-square= 4.393 P = .111
Total	N= 22 %= 13.75	N= 113 %= 70.63	N= 25 %= 15.63	160 100.00	

11.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 29 %= 18.12	N= 91 %= 56.88	N= 11 %= 6.87	131 81.88	Others Would Be Happier
Will Not Enroll	N= 4 %= 2.50	N= 18 %= 11.25	N= 7 %= 4.38	29 18.13	Chi-square= 6.222 P** = .045
Total	N= 33 %= 20.62	N= 109 %= 68.13	N= 18 %= 11.25	160 100.00	

12.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will	N= 35 %= 21.87	N= 74 %= 46.24	N= 22 %= 13.75	131 81.88	Faculty Mean More
Will Not Enroll	N= 3 %= 1.88	N= 19 %= 11.88	N= 7 %= 4.38	29 18.13	Chi-square= 3.719 P = .156
Total	N= 38 %= 23.75	N= 93 %= 58.12	N= 29 %= 18.13	160 100.00	

Table 7 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics On the Match Scale for the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups*

13.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 48 %= 30.00	N= 75 %= 46.87	N= 8 %= 5.00	131 81.88	Easier To Help Others
Will Not Enroll	N= 3 %= 1.88	N= 18 %= 11.25	N= 8 %= 5.00	29 18.13	Chi-square=16.200 P** = .001
Total	N= 51 %= 31.88	N= 93 %= 58.12	N= 16 %= 10.00	160 100.00	

14.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 11 %= 6.88	N= 93 %= 58.12	N= 27 %= 16.87	131 81.88	School Far Away From Home
Will Not Enroll	N= 2 %= 1.25	N= 25 %= 15.63	N= 2 %= 1.25	29 18.13	Chi-square= 3.275 P = .194
Total	N= 13 %= 8.13	N= 118 %= 73.75	N= 29 %= 18.12	160 100.00	

15.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will	N= 22 %= 13.75	N= 103 %= 64.37	N= 6 %= 3.75	131 81.88	Can Handle Program
Will Not Enroll	N= 0 %= .00	N= 26 %= 16.25	N= 3 %= 1.88	29 18.13	Chi-square= 6.631 P = .036 Expected
Total	N= 22 %= 13.75	N= 129 %= 80.62	N= 9 %= 5.63	160 100.00	frequencies less than 5.

Table 7 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics On the Match Scale for the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups*

16.

	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 72 %= 45.00	N= 46 %= 28.75	N= 13 %= 8.13	131 81.88	Family Better Afford
Will Not Enroll	N= 5 %= 3.12	N= 16 %= 10.00	N= 8 %= 5.00	29 18.13	Chi-square=15.129 P** = .001
Total	N= 77 %= 48.12	N= 62 %= 38.75	N= 21 %= 13.13	160 100.00	

17.

	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 9 %= 5.63	N= 112 %= 70.00	N= 10 %= 6.25	131 81.88	Others Want
Will Not Enroll	N= 0 %= .00	N= 23 %= 14.37	N= 6 %= 3.75	29 18.13	Chi-square= 6.147 P = .046
Total	N= 9 %= 5.63	N= 135 %= 84.37	N= 16 %= 10.00	160 100.00	Expected frequencies less than 5.

18.

	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will	N= 40 %= 25.00	N= 81 %= 50.62	N= 10 %= 6.25	131 81.88	Performance Better
Will Not Enroll	N= 3 %= 1.88	N= 20 %= 12.50	N= 6 %= 3.75	29 18.13	Chi-square= 7.840 P** = .020
Total	N= 43 %= 26.88	N= 101 %= 63.12	N= 16 %= 10.00	160 100.00	

Table 7 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics On the Match Scale for the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups*

19.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 13 %= 8.13	N= 90 %= 56.24	N= 28 %= 17.50	131 81.88	Higher Family Status
Will Not Enroll	N= 2 %= 1.25	N= 19 %= 11.88	N= 8 %= 5.00	29 18.13	Chi-square= .675 P = .714
Total	N= 15 %= 9.38	N= 109 %= 68.13	N= 36 %= 22.50	160 100.00	

20.	URI	No Diff.	OS	Total	
Will Enroll	N= 54 %= 33.75	N= 66 %= 41.24	N= 11 %= 6.87	131 81.88	Control of Life Plans
Will Not Enroll	N= 5 %= 3.13	N= 17 %= 10.63	N= 7 %= 4.38	29 18.13	Chi-square= 9.243 P** = .010
Total	N= 59 %= 36.88	N= 83 %= 51.87	N= 18 %= 11.25	160 100.00	

* Chi-square and P for Enroll Groups are based on a comparison of the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups. Participants not admitted were excluded from this analysis.

** $P < .05$.

significant at the .05 level. However, two of the factors, 15 and 17 were disregarded because 33% of the cells had expected frequencies less than 5.

For each of the eight factors in which there were significant differences between the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" groups, the difference lay in the choice of the University of Rhode Island as the better match. Significantly more respondents who "Will Enroll" at URI believed URI was the better match for the following choice factors: a) affordability; b) better academic program; c) close proximity to home; d) people about whom they cared would be happier; e) easier to help family and friends; f) the financial strain of the family would be less; g) academic performance would be better; h) better control of life plans.

In addition, for those who "Will Not Enroll", significantly more, 48%, chose the Other School as having the better program for the degree they wanted while only 23% of those who plan to enroll at URI chose the Other School as the better match. For each of the remaining factors, both groups chose No Difference as the predominant response. However, what is unknown from the data is whether or not both schools were perceived as equally adequate or equally lacking in terms of those factors.

When the results of the Importance and Match Scales were viewed together, an interesting pattern emerged. First, three more factors were viewed as important by the "Will Enroll" group than by the "Will Not Enroll" group. Second, the construct expressed by those three factors was utilitarian; those who "Will Enroll" seemed to place more emphasis on utilitarian factors. Alternately it could be said that respondents who did not plan to enroll at URI viewed utilitarian factors as less important. Third, those who "Will Enroll" at URI showed a clear preference for URI when comparing URI with the other institution. Those who "Will Not Enroll" at URI chose the Other School as the better match for the degree program they wanted and apparently saw no difference between URI and the other school when responding to the request to match the other factors.

It would appear that four factors influenced graduate school choice in this study: a) accepted applicants who "Will Enroll" at URI choose more utilitarian factors as important than did those who "Will Not Enroll"; b) those who plan to enroll choose factors which indicate a balance between utilitarian and nonutilitarian factors; c) for those who do not plan to enroll, nonutilitarian factors dominated their choice factors; d) a

significantly larger percent of those not planning to attend URI chose the Other School as the better match for academic program than those who planned to attend URI.

4.6 Classification of "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" by Enrollment Intent

A two-group, discriminant analyses was performed to determine if the responses to the 20 importance factors on the survey could be used to correctly classify admitted participants into two groups, "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll". All factors were considered concurrently. The full admitted sample of respondents (160) was used to carry out the discriminant analysis. The discriminant analysis was then carried out to classify the admitted respondents into the two posterior groups. Justification for using the same respondents for computing the discriminant function and for developing the classification matrix was that sample size did not permit use of an analysis group and a holdout group.

Table 8 reflects a measure of the statistical significance of the discriminant function and the 20 factors. The centroids of those planning to attend URI and those not planning to attend are significantly different. The chi-square value of 34.97 is highly significant beyond the .02 level. The sizes of the centroids indicate that those who "Will Enroll" generally view

Table 8

Group Means and Significance Tests With the Importance Scale for the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups (N=160)

	Respondent Status: Will Enroll (N=131) Mean	Will Not Enroll (N=29) Mean	Significance Tests
Factors			
1. Better Afford	2.30	1.96	4.05*
2. Learn More	2.67	2.51	1.31
3. Better Job	2.30	2.10	1.52
4. Better Research	2.22	2.44	1.69
5. Better Program	2.67	2.68	0.01
6. School Close to Home	2.39	1.58	23.62*
7. Longtime Goal	1.46	1.37	0.39
8. Higher Self Status	1.90	1.82	0.23
9. Cannot Handle Program	1.19	1.13	0.40
10. Better Support Family	2.05	1.72	3.68*
11. Others Would Be Happier	1.50	1.51	0.01
12. Faculty Mean More	1.69	1.68	0.01
13. Easier To Help Others	1.76	1.62	0.74
14. School Away From Home	1.04	1.10	1.00
15. Can Handle Program	1.30	1.34	0.10
16. Family Better Afford	2.06	1.75	3.09
17. Others Want	1.09	1.13	0.39
18. Performance Better	1.85	1.82	0.03
19. Higher Family Status	1.26	1.34	0.49
20. Control Of Life Plans	2.04	1.96	0.22
Centroids	0.24	-1.09	34.97**

* F-ratios significant beyond the .05 level.
** Chi-square significant beyond the 0.02 level.

the survey factors to be more important than those who "Will Not Enroll". The same one way analysis of variance used in Table 6 identifies factors on which the two groups differ significantly: factor 1 (better able to afford); factor 6 (closeness to home); and, Factor 10 (better able to support family upon graduation). The relative importance of each of the factors in discriminating between the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" groups is also displayed in Table 9. Discriminant loadings of +/- .30 or higher are considered significant. Factors 1, 6, and 10 are the factors containing discriminatory power. A ranking of the factors shows that factor 6 (closeness to home), has the highest relative discriminatory power and is followed by factor 1 (affordability), and factor 10 (better able to support family upon graduation). These are the same factors identified as significant through the one-way analysis of variance tests reported in Tables 6 and 8.

Although the discriminant weights would include factors 4 (better research), and 12 (faculty mean more), as significant factors as well, and, exclude factor 1 as having discriminatory power, discriminant loadings are considered somewhat more valid than weights. Discriminatory weights are displayed here for comparison purposes.

Table 9

Discriminant Weights and Loadings On the Importance Scale of the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups (N=160)

Factors	Discriminant Weights	Rank	Discriminant Loadings	Rank
1. Better Afford	.23	6	.31*	2
2. Learn More	.14	11	.18	7
3. Better Job	.13	13	.19	6
4. Better Research	-.32	2	-.20	5
5. Better Program	-.13	12	-.01	19
6. School Close to Home	.82	1	.75*	1
7. Longtime Goal	.16	9	.10	13
8. Higher Self Status	.11	15	.07	14
9. Cannot Handle Program	.04	18	.10	11
10. Better Support Family	.30	4	.30*	3
11. Others Would Be Happier	-.16	10	-.02	18
12. Faculty Mean More	.31	3	.01	20
13. Easier To Help Others	-.22	7	.13	9
14. School Away From Home	-.17	8	-.15	8
15. Can Handle Program	-.12	14	-.05	16
16. Family Better Afford	.26	5	.27	4
17. Others Want	-.02	20	-.10	12
18. Performance Better	-.02	19	.03	17
19. Higher Family Status	-.05	16	-.11	10
20. Control Of Life Plans	-.05	17	.07	15

* Loadings of +/- .30 or higher are viewed as significant in interpreting discrimination between groups. Weights are displayed for comparison purposes.

The critical cutting score (Z value) and the individual discriminant scores in Table 10 were used to generate classification matrix number one (1) in Table 11. Prior probabilities of group membership were adjusted to match the population distribution: a) 52% for the "Will Enroll" group; and b) 48% for the "Will Not Enroll group.

The use of the discriminant function resulted in a classification of 22 (76%) of 29 of the "Will Not Enroll" group, and, 102 (78%) of 131 of the "Will Enroll" group. The overall classification accuracy was 77.50%. Chance was 51%. The proportional chance criterion was used to compute chance because of unequal group size and the desire to accurately classify members of both groups. Classification accuracy at approximately 25% of chance is considered significant (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Grablowsky, 1985).

Although the discriminant function produced a classification accuracy above the 25% minimum, additional discriminant analyses were performed. The purpose was to try to lower classification accuracy in order to judge the degree of upward classification bias which might have been caused by classifying the same individuals as were used in computing the discriminant function. A two-group, stepwise 'jackknife' discriminant analysis was

Table 10

Discriminant Scores On the Importance Scale of the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups (N=160)Z value = -.0001

Respondent Number	Actual Group	Classified Group	Discriminant Scores*
1	1	1	0.12
2	1	1	1.08
3	1 **	2	-1.43
4	1	1	-0.12
5	1	1	0.29
6	1 **	2	-1.70
7	2	1	-1.12
8	1	1	-0.41
9	1	1	0.48
10	1	1	0.44
11	1 **	2	-0.98
12	1	1	0.01
13	1 **	2	-1.20
14	1	1	0.18
15	1	1	0.62
16	1	1	0.83
17	1	1	-0.96
18	1	1	-0.47
19	2	2	-1.01
20	1	1	-1.02
21	1 **	2	-1.07
22	1 **	2	-1.58
23	1 **	2	0.95
24	2 **	1	-1.05
25	1	1	1.94
26	1	1	0.74

* Means for Discriminant Scores: "Will Enroll" = 0.24; "Will Not Enroll" = -1.09.

** "Will Enroll" Group = 1; "Will Not Enroll" Group = 2.

Table 10 (continued)

Discriminant Scores On the Importance Scale of the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups (N=160)Z value = -.0001

Respondent Number	Actual Group	Classified Group	Discriminant Scores*
27	2	2	-2.09
28	2	2	-0.90
29	1	1	-0.23
30	1 **	2	-1.90
31	2	2	-0.74
32	1 **	2	-0.76
33	1	1	1.31
34	1	1	2.20
35	2	2	-1.80
36	2	2	-1.57
37	2 **	1	-0.18
38	2	1	-0.72
39	1	1	1.41
40	2	2	-1.99
41	2 **	1	0.11
42	1	1	0.79
43	1	1	0.93
44	1	1	0.06
45	1	1	0.65
46	1 **	2	-0.89
47	1	1	0.17
48	1	1	0.01
49	2 **	1	-0.26
50	1	1	-0.01
51	2 **	1	0.43
52	2	2	-0.90
53	2	2	-2.33
54	1	1	1.11

* Means for Discriminant Scores: "Will Enroll" = 0.24; "Will Not Enroll" = -1.09.

** "Will Enroll" Group = 1; "Will Not Enroll" Group = 2.

Table 10 (continued)

Discriminant Scores On the Importance Scale of the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups (N=160)Z value = -.0001

Respondent Number	Actual Group	Classified Group	Discriminant Scores*
55	1	1	0.80
56	1 **	2	-0.65
57	1	1	0.44
58	1	1	-0.20
59	1	1	0.54
60	1	1	-2.62
61	1	1	0.43
62	1	1	0.23
63	1 **	2	-1.85
64	1	1	-0.02
65	1	1	-0.42
66	1	1	1.68
67	2 **	1	-0.01
68	1	1	2.58
69	1	1	1.23
70	1	1	0.38
71	1	1	0.13
72	1	1	0.10
73	1	1	1.14
74	1	1	1.21
75	1	1	1.21
76	1	1	-1.06
77	1	1	1.61
78	1	1	0.87
79	2 **	1	-1.46
80	1	1	0.93
81	1	1	0.56

* Means for Discriminant Scores: "Will Enroll" = 0.24; "Will Not Enroll" = -1.09.

** "Will Enroll" Group = 1; "Will Not Enroll" Group = 2.

Table 10 (continued)

Discriminant Scores On the Importance Scale of the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups (N=160)Z value = -.0001

Respondent Number	Actual Group	Classified Group	Discriminant Scores*
82	1	1	0.08
83	1	1	-0.01
84	1	1	0.71
85	2	2	-1.47
86	1	1	0.34
87	2	2	-1.74
88	1	1	0.29
89	1 **	2	-0.57
90	1 **	2	-1.52
91	1	1	-0.28
92	1	1	1.00
93	1	1	1.68
94	1 **	2	-0.97
95	1	1	0.82
96	1	1	0.91
97	1	1	1.33
98	1 **	2	-0.86
99	1	1	0.66
100	1	1	0.39
101	1	1	0.39
102	1	1	1.78
103	1	1	1.03
104	1	1	-0.36
105	1	1	1.84
106	2 **	1	-1.18
107	1	1	1.30
108	1	1	0.29

* Means for Discriminant Scores: "Will Enroll" = 0.24; "Will Not Enroll" = -1.09.

** "Will Enroll" Group = 1; "Will Not Enroll" Group = 2.

Table 10 (continued)

Discriminant Scores On the Importance Scale of the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups (N=160)Z value = -.0001

Respondent Number	Actual Group	Classified Group	Discriminant Scores*
109	1	1	0.55
110	1	1	-0.10
111	1	1	1.62
112	1	1	0.59
113	1 **	2	-1.52
114	1 **	2	-1.29
115	2	2	-2.35
116	1	1	0.42
117	1	1	0.07
118	1	1	0.70
119	1 **	2	-1.56
120	2	2	-0.62
121	1	1	-0.12
122	1	1	1.06
123	1	1	1.36
124	1	1	-0.31
125	1	1	0.91
126	1 **	2	-1.12
127	1	1	1.35
128	1	1	0.83
129	1	1	1.26
130	1	1	0.21
131	1 **	2	-2.39
132	1 **	2	-0.78
133	1	1	0.33
134	1	1	0.54
135	1	1	1.86

* Means for Discriminant Scores: "Will Enroll" = 0.24; "Will Not Enroll" = -1.09.

** "Will Enroll" Group = 1; "Will Not Enroll" Group = 2.

Table 10 (continued)

Discriminant Scores On the Importance Scale of the 20 Enrollment Factors for the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" Groups (N=160)Z value = -.0001

Respondent Number	Actual Group	Classified Group	Discriminant Scores*
136	1	1	0.91
137	1	1	-0.01
138	2 **	1	1.01
139	1	1	1.32
140	1 **	2	-1.25
141	1	1	0.15
142	1	1	0.41
143	1	1	0.33
144	1 **	2	-0.60
145	1	1	1.05
146	1	1	0.55
147	1	1	2.55
148	1	1	0.71
149	1	1	-0.26
150	1	1	0.21
151	1	1	0.51
152	2	2	-1.42
153	2 **	1	0.60
154	1	1	1.03
155	2	2	-1.96
156	1	1	0.17
157	1 **	2	-1.48
158	2	2	-2.10
159	1 **	2	-1.24
160	1 **	2	-0.94

* Means for Discriminant Scores: "Will Enroll" = 0.24; "Will Not Enroll" = -1.09.

** "Will Enroll" Group = 1; "Will Not Enroll" Group = 2.

Table 11

Summary of Discriminant Analyses Results
Priors = "Will Enroll" .52; "Will Not Enroll" .48

#1 Simultaneous Method

Classification*

	Enroll		Will Not Enroll		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Enroll	102	77.90	29	22.10	131	100.00
Will Not Enroll	7	24.10	22	75.90	29	100.00

* Percent correctly classified = 77.5%. Number of Factors = 20.

#2 Stepwise Method

Classification*

	Enroll		Will Not Enroll		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Enroll	105	80.00	26	20.00	131	100.00
Will Not Enroll	10	34.00	19	66.00	29	100.00

* Percent correctly classified = 77.5%. Number of Factors = 20.

Table 11 (continued)

Summary of Discriminant Analyses Results
Priors = "Will Enroll" .52; "Will Not Enroll" .48

#3 Simultaneous Method

Classification*

	Enroll		Will Not Enroll		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Enroll	95	72.50	36	27.50	131	100.00
Will Not Enroll	8	27.60	21	72.40	29	100.00

* Percent correctly classified = 72.5%. Number of Factors = 3.

performed; Table 11 (analysis 2) shows the results. The jackknife discriminant function classified 19 (65.5%) of 29 of the "Will Not Enroll" group correctly, and, 105 (80%) of 131 of the "Will Enroll" group correctly. The overall classification accuracy was 77.5%. There was no change in the result from the first analysis.

A third two-group, discriminant analysis was performed. The results are also reported in Table 11 (analysis 3). This time the simultaneous method was used, but the number of factors was limited to the three factors which showed some discriminatory power: factor 1 (better afford); factor 6 (close to home); and factor 10 (better able to support family). The use of the discriminant function resulted in the classification of 21 (72%) of 29 of the "Will Not Enroll" group, and, 95 (72.5%) of 131 of the "Will Enroll" group. The overall classification accuracy was 72.5%, a drop of 5% from the first discriminant analysis. Classification accuracy for this third analysis is still well above that required for significance and represents the lowest classification accuracy achieved. However, 5.4% fewer respondents who would enroll were classified correctly.

For the stepwise discriminant analysis and the simultaneous analysis using three factors, F-statistics were identical to the

simultaneous method. Although weights, loadings and discriminant scores differed, no substantive changes were noted among the three analyses. Factors 1, 6, and 10 continued to maintain their position as the strongest and only factors having discriminatory power at the .05 level or higher.

Clearly the three factors have discriminatory power. The classification power of the factors, however, is interpreted with caution because the degree of upward bias is not precisely known. Discriminant analyses results point in a positive direction and based on the factors examined, prediction of who will and will not enroll at the University of Rhode Island appears possible.

4.7 Analysis of Open-ended Questions

Items 25 through 27 on the survey asked participants to state their primary reason for: a) wanting to go to graduate school; b) wanting to attend URI; and c) wanting to attend the Other School. Frequency counts were then generated for the four major groups, "Admitted", "Denied", "Will Enroll", and "Will Not Enroll" and their subgroups by sex, residence, and age. No differences among groups or their subgroups were apparent, results are therefore reported in the aggregate in Table 12. The ability to get a better job was the most frequently chosen

Table 12

Summary of Reasons for Wanting to Attend Graduate School, URI, and the Other School

Reasons	Graduate School (N=172)	URI (N=169)	Other School (N=149)
Better Afford	3	19	18
Learn More	49	3	2
Better Job	113	2	6
Better Research	3	5	9
Better Program	3	70	43
Close to Home	0	51	24
Long Time Goal	0	1	1
Self Status Higher	1	4	33
Can't Handle Program	0	1	0
Others Happier	0	1	1
Faculty Association	0	0	9
Far Away From Home	0	0	3

reason for wanting to attend graduate school; learning more was the second most frequent reason identified. Among respondents who indicated reasons for wanting to attending URI, the most frequently mentioned reason was program quality; closeness to home was the second most popular reason stated; and better able to afford URI was the third most popular response.

When asked for their primary reason for wanting to attend the Other School, a better academic program was mentioned most often by respondents but, for their second most frequent response, higher self status was identified. Closeness to home was the third most frequent response; better able to afford the Other School was the fourth most frequent response.

It is clear from the frequencies that when required to state a single reason for wanting to attend graduate school the major factor in the decision was the hope of obtaining a better job, coupled with wanting to learn more. However, the decision about attending a specific graduate school, whether the school was to be URI or the Other School, was influenced by the desire to attend that school which had the better academic program. This latter factor would appear to help students achieve the goals of a better job and learning more. It is interesting to note that the second most frequently chosen reason for wanting to attend

URI was the school's closeness to home, while higher self status was the second most frequently chosen reason for attending the other school. Whereas 82% of the surveyed population expressed their intent to enroll at URI, the higher self status factor apparently was not a significant factor in the final graduate school selection decisions.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

5.1 Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify factors salient to University of Rhode Island applicants in their decision to attend URI as opposed to other graduate schools. In addition to identifying factors, other issues addressed included: a) measuring the degree of importance these factors might have in graduate school choice for those admitted; b) identifying any significant differences which might exist between the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" groups; and c) determining whether or not enrollment intent could be predicted.

The factors which were most important to URI graduate school applicants were: a) affordability; b) learning more; c) getting a better job; d) better research e) better program for the degree desired; f) the graduate school's close proximity to home; g) being able to better support his/her family upon graduation; h) less financial strain on the family while in school; and i) respondents would feel more in control of their life plans by attending one graduate school as opposed to another.

In terms of the instrument itself, reliability was measured, using coefficient alpha and the correlated split-half reliability method. The levels of reliability were in the .70's which were quite reasonable for a 20 item instrument; and certainly high enough for group analysis of the data.

A factor analysis of the responses to the 20 factors using the ratings on the Importance Scale did identify three strong, psychologically interpretable factors which matched the constructs used to develop the survey questions: 1) Self Approval; 2) Utilitarian Costs; and 3) Concern for Others. A fourth factor was not as well defined and consisted of two survey items which were psychologically interpretable as utilitarian for self concerns and one which was inconsistent with the other two, a concern for others. Overall, the discriminant validity of the instrument appeared to be high.

Differences did exist between the "Will Enroll" and the "Will Not Enroll" groups concerning the importance of the 20 factors in choosing a graduate school. Three factors discriminated between the two groups: a) affordability; b) attending a graduate school close to home; and c) being better able to support one's family after graduation. Those who planned to enroll at URI thought these factors were important,

those who did not plan to enroll believed these factors were less important. Also, those who planned to enroll chose more utilitarian factors than did those who did not plan to enroll.

In terms of which alternative, URI or the Other School, was the better match to the 20 importance factors, the two groups differed significantly on eight factors. Those who planned to enroll at the University of Rhode Island chose URI as the better match for: a) affordability; b) better academic program; c) the graduate school's close proximity to home; d) others would be happier; e) easier to help family and friends; f) less financial strain on the family; g) academic performance would be better; and h) feeling more in control of life plans. For seven of the eight factors, those not planning to enroll chose No Difference as their response. However, on one factor, better academic program, those who would not enroll chose the Other School.

The difference between the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" groups were also highlighted in discriminant analyses. The discriminatory power of the three importance factors: a) affordability; b) closeness to home; and c) better able to support family after graduation, was reinforced by discriminant loadings which identified them and no other factors as significant.

The classification power of the the 20 factors is tentatively supported by a classification accuracy of 78 percent, chance being equal to 51 percent based on the proportional chance criterion. No significant difference in classification power was observed when variables and discriminant methods were changed.

Based on responses to the open-ended questions, both the "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll" groups, and their subgroups by sex, residence, and age, tended to offer the same reason(s) for wanting to attend graduate school, attend URI, and attend a graduate school other than URI. The primary reason for wanting to attend graduate school was to obtain a better job. The most frequent reasons for wanting to attend URI or the Other School was the same: the quality of the academic program.

5.2 Discussion of Results

The survey appeared to lead to reliable and valid information. Factors have been identified which appear to be important to people in the choice between graduate schools. Factors which discriminant between groups are also evident. Some factors appear to influence decision making. And, it appears possible to predict enrollment intent on the basis of survey results.

The application of Janis and Mann's (1977) cognitive decision making constructs of utilitarian and affective concerns for self and others was assessed in the context of choice between graduate schools for University of Rhode Island graduate school applicants. Results from a one way analysis of variance showed that while both utilitarian and affective factors are considered important, and are at play in the choice between graduate schools, utilitarian concerns comprised all three of those factors which showed significant discrimination between groups regarding importance. Those who planned to attend URI were far more utilitarian in their motivations than those who did not plan to attend.

In addition, for those who did not plan to attend URI, significantly more, 48%, chose the Other School as having the better academic program for the degree they wanted, while only 23% of those planning to enroll at URI chose the Other School as the better match. Having a better academic program was not viewed in a significantly different way by the "Will Enroll" and the "Will Not Enroll" groups in terms of importance, both groups believed this to be an important factor. But, only on this factor was there a significant difference between the two groups relative to matching factors to the Other School.

The profile of the students who applied to the University of Rhode Island's graduate school is as follows: they were students who believe that in choosing a graduate school it is important to consider how much they will learn at that school, how good the research is at that school, and which school has the better academic program. The applicants were also concerned about which school would enable them to be more in control of their life plans. They wanted the school of choice to be located close to home. They were concerned about which school would be most affordable, which school would be less of a financial strain on their family, and which school would enable them to get a better job and support their family better upon graduation.

But, the profile of students who chose URI was limited to three factors. They consider which school they could better afford to attend, and, which degree would enable them to better support their families upon graduation. They also wanted the graduate school of choice to be close to home. None of these factors were considered important by those who did not plan to attend URI.

And finally, whether participants planned to enroll at URI or not, they were most likely to enroll at that school which

they believed had the better academic program match for the degree they wanted. Those who thought URI was the better school for the degree they wanted, indicated their intent to enroll at URI. Those not planning to attend URI chose the Other School as the best match for the degree they wanted.

The relative importance of the factors and the match of those factors to URI and the Other School were determined by the respondents prior to admission, and, prior to the enrollment decision. This is a significant point assuming respondents followed directions and were honest in recording their admission status and enrollment intent. Because the importance and match decisions were made by the participants prior to their knowing whether or not they were admitted to URI, no post decisional bolstering of school choice could be made. Studies which ask admitted or enrolled students to retrospectively identify importance factors may be subject to some bias in that participants may wish to support an attendance decision already made by responding more favorably to the survey than they might otherwise.

In terms of this study, Janis and Mann's theory argues that once the decisions were made as to: 1) which factors were important to consider when choosing a graduate school; and 2)

which alternative graduate school best matched those factors on the survey, such prior decisions would influence the subsequent intent to enroll decisions. It is assumed, for example, that upon admission, the student would attend the school which has already been declared as best matching the importance factors rather than to lose the benefits associated with those factors by attending the other school.

Differentiation between groups was also supported by the discriminant analysis results. Discriminant loadings identified the same three factors as discriminating between the "Will Enroll" group and the "Will Not Enroll" group as did the one way analysis of variance.

The use of discriminant analysis also resulted in the classification of members of both groups, "Will Enroll" and "Will Not Enroll", at a rate very much higher than could have been expected if classification were by chance. This is critical because if classification accuracy were no better than could be expected by chance, enrollment potential could not be judged. The survey instrument could not be used to predict enrollment intent.

Classification power is labeled tentative because of the upward bias in classification accuracy caused by classifying the

same individuals as were used in computing the discriminant function. Although the discriminant analysis appears to support the instrument's ability to predict enrollment intent, some caution is needed.

The classification accuracy of the discriminant analysis was reduced by setting prior probabilities of group membership to match the population distribution rather than the sample distribution. In addition, attempts were made to further reduce classification accuracy utilizing different computational methods. A stepwise 'jackknife' procedure generated a 77.5% classification accuracy and a simultaneous method utilizing only the three significant factors as independent variables generated a 72.5% classification accuracy. Regardless of which method was used, classification accuracy exceeded chance (51%) by a significant margin. A classification accuracy 25% of chance is considered significant.

It is also important to note that when responses to the open-ended questions were compared to the survey questions, all open-ended responses matched one of the 20 survey questions in terms of content. This supports the completeness of the questions developed for the survey.

5.3 Suggestions for Additional Research

The knowledge gained through this study will have to be verified through replication. However, at the very least this study supports: a) a continued investigation into the applicability of the Janis and Mann theory to this kind of decision making; and b) expansion of the research to strengthen the survey instrument and to test its universality.

Due to the limitations placed on the study because of time constraints and the requirement for participant anonymity, the enrollment factor was operationalized by asking participants to designate their expected enrollment decision. It would be preferable to use actual enrollment behavior rather than enrollment intent in future studies.

The question of whether or not applicants to a Spring admission term differ from those applying to a Fall admission term could be explored also. While it is not anticipated that differences do exist, verification is needed.

Finally, the study did not address the antecedent decision of whether or not to attend graduate school. This represents an additional area of research which could be combined with research on the choice factors to provide an expanded approach to the issue.

References

Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 67, 422-436.

Anderson, J. R. (1983). The Architecture of cognition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Antrobus, J. S. (1970). Cognition and affect. Boston: Little, Brown.

Astin, A. W. (1969). Comment of "A student's dilemma". Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16, 20-22.

Astin, A. W. (1971). Two approaches to measuring students' perceptions of their college environment. Journal of College Student Personnel, 12, 161-172.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American Psychologist, 37, 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1982). The psychology of chance encounters and life paths. American Psychologist, 37, 747-755.

Berry, D. (1971). A Multi-phasic motivational paridigm for adult education. Adult Education, 22, 48-56.

Boshier, R. (1971). Motivational orientations of adult education participants: A factor analytic exploration of Houle's typology. Adult Education Journal, 21, 3-26.

Boshier, R. (1977). Motivational orientations re-visited: life-space motives and the education participation scale. Adult Education, 28, 89-115.

Bourne, L. E., Dominowski, R. L., & Loftus, E. F. (1979). Cognitive process. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Breland, H. M. (1981). Assessing student characteristics in admissions to higher education. New York: College Board.

Burgess, P. (1971). Reasons for adult participation in group educational activities. Adult Education, 22, 3-29.

Carpenter, F. (1974). The Skinner primer: Behind freedom and dignity. London: Collier-Macmillan.

Carrol, J. S., & Payne, J. W. (1976). Cognition and social behavior. New York: Wiley.

Claxton, G. (1980). Cognitive psychology: New directions. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Colten, M. E., & Janis, I. L. (1982). Effects of self-disclosure and the decisional balance-sheet procedure. In I. L. Janis (Ed.), Counseling on personal decisions: Theory and research on helping short-term relationships. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Creager, J. A. (1968). Use of research results in matching students and colleges. The Journal of College Student Personnel, 9,(5), 312-321.

De Charms, R. (1968). Personal causation. New York: Academic Press.

Deci, E. L. (1972). Intrinsic motivation, extrinsic reinforcement and inequity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 22, 113-120.

Dickinson, G. (1971). Educational variables and participation in adult education: An exploratory study. Adult Education, 22, 36-47.

Engel, J. F., Fiorillo, H. F., & Cayley, M. A. (1972). Market segmentation concepts and applications. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Estes, W. K. (1970). Learning theory and mental development. New York: Academic Press.

Fesitnger, L. A. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Festinger, L. A. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations. 7, 117-140.

Festinger, L. A. (1964). Conflict, decision, and dissonance. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Forgus, R. H. (1966). Perception: The basic process in cognitive development. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Forman, G. E., & Sigel, I. (1979). Cognitive development: A life-span view. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Gilmartin, K. J. (1984). Measuring the viability of colleges: Who is really in distress? American Educational Research Journal, 21, 79-101.

Gordon, V. N. (1982). Reasons for entering college and academic and vocational preferences. Journal of College Student Personnel, September, 371-377.

Gorman, W. P. (1976). Evaluation of student-attracting methods. College and University, Winter, 221-225.

Grabowski, S. M. (1981). Marketing in higher education. (Report No. 5) Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 445).

Gregg, L. W. (Ed.). (1974). Knowledge and cognition. New York: Wiley.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., & Grablowsky, B. (1985). Multivariate Data Analysis. Tulsa: PPC Books.

Hamner, W. C., Ross, J., & Staw, B. M. (1978). Motivation in organizations: The need for a new direction. In D. W. Organ (Ed.), The Applied Psychology of Work Behavior (pp. 225-249). Dallas: Business Publications.

Hesburgh, T.M. (1985). Educational institutions are vulnerable. Higher Education & National Affairs, 21, 8.

Hillner, K. P. (1979). Conditioning in contemporary perspective. New York: Springer.

Hogarth, R. M. (1980). Judgement and choice: The psychology of decision. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Homans, G. (1961). Social behavior: Its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Hossler, D., (1984). Enrollment management: An integrated approach, New York: College Board.

Hoyt, M. F., & Janis, I. L. (1975). Increasing adherence to a stressful decision via a motivational balance-sheet procedure: a field experiment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 833-839.

Huddleston, T. (1976). Marketing: The applicant questionnaire. College and University, Winter, 214-219.

Ihlanfeldt, W., (1980). Achieving optimal enrollment and tuition revenues. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Janis, I. L., & Mann, L. (1977). Decision making: A psychological analysis of conflict, choice, and commitment. New York: The Free Press.

Janis, I. L. (1959). Decisional conflicts: A theoretical analysis, Journal of Conflict Resolution, III, 6-27.

Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., & Tversky, A. (1982). Judgement under uncertainty: heuristics and biases. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A., (1973). On the psychology of prediction. Psychological Review, 80, 237-251.

Keeney, R. L., & Raiffa, H. (1976). Decisions with multiple objectives: Preferences and value tradeoffs. New York: Wiley.

Kemerer, F. R., Baldridge, J. V., & Green, K. C. (1982). Strategies for effective enrollment management. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Kotler, P. (1971). Marketing decision making: A model building approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kotler, P. (1982). Marketing for nonprofit organizations. Englewoods Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lay R., & Maguire, J. (1980). Identifying the competition in higher education-two approaches. College and University, 56, 53-64.

Leister, D. V. (1975). Identifying institutional clientele: applied metamarketing in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 66, 381-398.

Leslie, L. L., & Johnson, G. P. (1974). The market model and higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 65, 1-9.

Lewin, K. (1938). The conceptual representation and the measurement of psychological forces. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Liney, T. J. (1985). Reauthorization of the higher education act: recommendations concerning graduate education. Council of Graduate Schools Communicator, 18, 4-5.

Litten, L. H., Sullivan, D., & Brodigan, D. L. (1983). Applying market research in college admissions. New York: College Board.

Locke, E. A. (1970). Job satisfaction and job performance: A theoretical analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 24, 125-149.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1302-1304). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Maguire, J. (1981). Marketing management. Annual meeting of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 1-62.

Maguire, J., & Lay, R. (1981). Modeling the college choice process: Image and decision. College and University, 56, 123-139.

Mann, L. (1972). Use of a "balance-sheet" procedure to improve the quality of personal decision making: A field experiment with college applicants, Journal of Vocational Behavior, 2, 291-300.

Manski, C. F., & Wise, D .A. (1983). College choice in America. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

McLoughlin, D. (1971). Participation of the adult learner in program planning. Adult Education, 22, 30-35.

Miller, D. W., & Starr, M. K. (1967). The structure of human decision. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Miller, R. (1981). Meaning and purpose in the intact brain. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Morris, D. R., Elliot, W. F., Huddleston, T., Vaccaro, J. B., Stump, D. J. (1977). Know your student market before you start to market. College and University, Summer, 605-615.

Moristain, B. R., & Smart, J. C. (1977). A motivational typology of adult learners. Journal of Higher Education, 68, 665-679.

Murphy, P. E., & McGarrity, R. A. (1978). Marketing universities: A survey of student recruitment activities. College and University, 53, 249-261.

Nafziger, D. H., Holland, J. L., Gottfredson, G. D. (1975). Student-college congruency as a predictor of satisfaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 132-139.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (1976). Projections of education: Statistics to 1986-1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Naylor, J. C., Pritchard, R. D., & Ilgen, D. R. (1980). A theory of behavior in organizations. New York: Academic Press.

Nye, R. D. (1979). What is B. F. Skinner really saying? Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ofshe, L., & Ofshe, R. (1970). Utility and choice in social action. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Olson, C., King, M. (1985). A preliminary analysis of the decision process of graduate students in college choice. College and University, 60, 304-315.

Owen, J. W., Campbell, R., Flanigan, P. R., & Wisdom, M. (1977). Marketing: Matching the student to the college. College and University, 52, 591-603.

Pervin, L. A. (1968). Performance and satisfaction as a function of individual fit. Sociological Bulletin, 69, (1), 56-68.

Peak, H. (1955). Attitudes and motivation. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation (pp. 149-188). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Pomazal, R. J. (1980). College enrollment motivation: A theoretical marketing approach. Journal of College Student Personnel, 2, 126-134.

Reitzes, D. C., & Mutran, E. (1980). Significant others and self conceptions: Factors influencing educational expectations and academic performance. Sociology of Education, 53, 21-32.

Reynolds, G. S. (1975). A primer of operant conditioning. Glenview, IL: Scott-Foresman.

Reynolds, P. D. (1971). A primer in theory construction. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Rotter, J. B. (1954). Social learning and clinical psychology. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schoemaker, P. J. H. (1980). Experiments of decisions under risk: The expected utility hypothesis. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff.

Simon, H. A. (1976). Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Skinner, B. F. (1953). Science and human behavior. New York: Macmillan.

Stern, G. G. (1970). People in context. New York: Wiley.

Taylor, R. N. (1984). Behavioral decision making. Glenview, IL: Scott-Foresman.

Tillery, D., & Kildegaard, T. (1973). Educational goals, attitudes and behaviors. Cambridge: Ballinger.

Tolman, E. C. (1951). Purposive behavior in animals and man (3rd ed.). London: Cambridge University Press.

Trent, J. W., & Medsker, L. L. (1969). Beyond high school. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman D. (1975). Judgement under uncertainty: heuristics and biases. In D. Wendt, & C. Vlek (Eds.). Utility, probability, and human decision making (pp. 141-162). Boston: Dordrecht-Holland.

Velicer, W. F., Prochaska, J. O., DiClemente, C. C., & Brandenburg, N. (1985). Decisional balance measure for assessing and predicting smoking status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1279-1289.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.

Watson, J. B. (1925). Behaviorism. New York: W. W. Norton.

Werts, C. E., & Watley, D. J. (1969). A student's dilemma. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16, 14-19. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. (1979). High school graduates: Projections for the fifty states (Publication No. 0120900000045000). Boulder, CO.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, The College Board. (1984). High school graduates: Projections for the fifty states (1982-2000) (Publication No. 2A129). Boulder, CO.

Zemsky, R. (1980). Can colleges control enrollment? Educational Record, 61, 10-15.

Appendix A

Survey: Student Factors in Student Choice of Graduate Schools

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
GRADUATE SCHOOL CHOICE STUDY

1. The University of Rhode Island requires that the rights and welfare of participants in any research be safeguarded. In order to participate in the survey you must sign and return this Informed Consent Form. Please read carefully the information provided below and if you decide to participate in this study you are asked to sign and return this form in the white envelope.

2. This study is being conducted as part of my doctoral dissertation, and, as an institutional research study for the Graduate School of the University of Rhode Island. My name is Robert B. Turcotte.

3. Your name and address were obtained from the University's administrative computer center and used to create a contact file for the initial mailing of this survey. Please complete the survey and seal it in the green-labeled envelope provided. After you have received your admission decision, mark the decision you have received from the University on the front of the green-labeled envelope, and, if admitted, mark whether or not you intend to enroll at the University of Rhode Island and mail in the survey.

4. The results of the study will be reported in the aggregate, no student's name or personally identifiable information can be included when the results are reported because that information is neither known nor of any interest. By returning your survey after the University's decision is made, you can insure that your responses will not influence the admission decision since no one will have any idea of your identity.

5. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Even if you initially agree to participate, you may end your participation at any time merely by not completing the next stage of the process. Stamped, addressed envelopes are provided for you so that you may respond. There is no cost to you.

6. The contacts you will have with Robert B. Turcotte are: a) this initial mailing; b) possible follow-up if the Consent Form is not returned per chance it has been misplaced, lost, or you have decided to participate but have not had time to respond. If you have any questions regarding the Consent Form you may contact Mr. Turcotte at 1-401-792-2262.

I hereby attest that I have read the Informed Consent Form and agree to participate in this study.

_____ _____

Name (please print) Signature Date

Choosing a Graduate School

The statements on the following pages reflect reasons which might enter into a decision to attend one specific graduate school as opposed to another. We are interested in the importance these reasons might have in the choice between attending URI and some other school you would attend if you did not choose URI.

The survey is divided into two parts. In Part A your task is to indicate the importance of various reasons in your final selection of a graduate school. Part B of the survey asks for some demographic data.

For the purposes of this study, the University of Rhode Island does not have to be your first choice school. It is important, however, that the other school you have in mind when answering the survey be either your first choice school, or, the school you would attend if you were not to enroll at the University of Rhode Island.

There are no right or wrong reasons for deciding which graduate school to attend. This is not a test and your answers represent the importance of these reasons for you alone. Your reasons for choosing a particular graduate school are as meaningful and correct as those reasons other persons may offer. Please base your answers on the information you currently have about each school.

Thank you for your cooperation and participation. Please turn the page and begin.

Part A

Suppose you received letters of acceptance from two Graduate Schools. One letter admits you to URI, the second letter admits you to some other graduate school you would want to attend. Your tasks are the following:

1. In the space provided below, enter the name of the other school.

2. Read each of the 20 possible reasons below for attending a Graduate School and then:

   I. Indicate the importance of the reason in your final choice. There are three (3) possible ratings: Not Important (NI), Somewhat Important (SI), and Important (I).

   Circle <u>one</u> of these three ratings beside each possible reason for attending a particular Graduate School.

   II. Regardless of your rating of importance, next, for each reason, indicate which school provides a better match, URI or the other school. For each reason, circle either URI (URI) or the Other School (OS). If there is no difference between the two schools, circle No Difference (ND).

<u>EXAMPLE</u>:

	IMPORTANCE			BEST MATCH?		
<u>REASON</u>	NOT <u>IMPORTANT</u>	SOMEWHAT <u>IMPORTANT</u>	<u>IMPORTANT</u>	<u>URI</u>	<u>OS</u>	<u>ND</u>
1. This school has good sports facilities.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND

In the example above, the person has indicated that sports facilities are a "somewhat important" reason in the final decision, but, that there is no difference between the two schools. Please begin the survey now.

	IMPORTANCE			BEST MATCH?		
REASON	NOT IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	URI	OS	ND
1. I can better afford to attend this school.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
2. I should learn more at this school.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
3. I will probably get a better job if I attend this school.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
4. Better research in my field is conducted at this school.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
5. This school has the better program for the degree I want.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
6. This school is located close to home.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
7. Attending this school has been a long-time goal of mine	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
8. My status from attending this school would be higher.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND

REASON	IMPORTANCE: NOT IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	BEST MATCH? URI	OS	ND
9. Some persons feel I can't handle the program at this school. I want to prove I can handle the program.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
10. A degree from this school should enable me to support my family better.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
11. Persons I care about would be happier if I attended this school.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
12. It would mean more to me to be associated with the faculty of this school.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
13. While attending this school it would be easier for me to help my family or friends.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
14. This school is far away from home, and, I want to be away from home.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND

REASON	IMPORTANCE			BEST MATCH?		
	NOT IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	URI	OS	ND
15. Some persons feel I can handle the program at this school.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
16. The financial strain on my family would be less if I attended this school.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
17. I would attend this school primarily because others want me to.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
18. My academic performance would be better at this school.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
19. The social prestige of my family would increase if I attend this school.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND
20. I would feel more in control of my life plans if I attend this school.	NI	SI	I	URI	OS	ND

Please turn to the next page.

Part B

To provide some background information on the participants in the study, I would appreciate it if you would answer the seven questions listed below.

21. Date you completed this survey: _____/_____/_____
(month) (day) (year)

22. What is your gender? (please circle one)
a. Male b. Female

23. How old are you? (please circle one)
a. 21 or under
b. 22-23
c. 24-25
d. 26-27
e. 28-29
f. 30-39
g. 40 or over

24. Are you a resident of Rhode Island? (please circle one)
a. Yes b. No

25. What is your primary reason for wanting to go to graduate school?

_____

_____

26. What is your primary reason for wanting to attend URI?

_____

_____

27. What is your primary reason for wanting to attend the other school?

_____

_____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Please place your survey in the green-labeled envelope provided and seal it. After you have received your admission decision from the University of Rhode Island, please check off on the front of the green-labeled envelope whether or not you have been accepted, and, whether or not you intend to enroll, and return the survey.